Provisional text

Distribution limited

IIEP WORKING PAPER

ORGANISING EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT: PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

by

John Oxenham and Robert Chambers
Institute of Development Studies
Brighton, Sussex

International Institute for Educational Planning
(established within the framework of Unesco)
7-9 rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75016 Paris

PROVISIONAL TEXT

IIEP/RP/23/12A(Prov.)
Paris, 3 November 1978
Original : English

This monograph is a contribution to the IIEP research project on "The administration and organisation of education in rural areas", directed by Raymond F. Lyons

ORGANISING EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT: PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

by

John Oxenham and Robert Chambers
Institute of Development Studies
Brighton, Sussex

ORGANISING EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT: PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES.

WHAT IS WRONG ?

PURPOSE.

We believe that almost any particular form of development* requires that somebody learn something. People can and do learn informally - through watching others, through trying something out, through listening to a friend's advice. They can also learn formally in situations deliberately organized and designed to help them learn. We believe - and who does not? - that such situations, when well organized and managed, can help people to develop themselves faster than they could or would, if they relied wholly upon learning informally. However, organizing such situations is by no means an art which has been brought to perfection. Many people over many years have dedicated themselves to improving

This monograph is a tiny part of that effort: it is meant to be useful to policy-makers and more especially practitioners who are concerned with organizing education and training for rural development. The aim is to draw practical lessons from experience. We are concerned both with problems and with opportunities.

Analysis and prescription can be at three levels. First, there is the level of grand generalisation at which words like integration, coordination, participation, decentralisation, and democratisation commonly flow with a freedom matched only by the imprecision with which they are used. We have tried to abstain from that. The second level is middle-range concerning particular practices (staff postings, incentive systems,

---

*What we mean by 'development' is described in the section on 'Definitions'.)

programming, work overloads, the frequency of meetings, organizational style, and the like). It is with this level that we are mainly concerned. The third level is that of the so-called nuts and bolts, the much-neglected detail of management (the layout of the form, the sequence in the agenda, who is invited to which meeting, the procedure for paying salaries, and the like). Although this third level is at once neglected and critical, we have not felt that it could be handled in a monograph of this length. Moreover, the details vary so much between national administrations, that discussion in detail is difficult if not impossible. But we would not wish the reader to imagine that our choice of the middle range implies that the third, more detailed level is unimportant; to the contrary, it is through that level that the remedies for problems and the measures to exploit opportunities have to be processed. The success of the remedies depends upon how effectively the detail is handled.

We wish to make explicit the main limitations of which we are aware. The evidence on which we draw is mainly from Africa and South Asia. We generalise freely for the sake of brevity, but the readers with experience of particular countries will qualify our statements on the basis of their experience. Not every option is applicable everywhere; not every approach is replicable everywhere. All the same, we believe that what we describe and assert is generally and usefully applicable in most of the countries of Africa and Asia.

As far as possible we have cited sources which are accessible and hope that readers who wish to pursue particular points will be able to do so through those sources.

A word on our stance towards learning and the purposes of education is necessary. Much is said nowadays about the impossibility or the futility of undertaking education or training for development in the absence of far-reaching political, social and economic reform (e.g. Bataille, 1976). The argument is roughly that any significant improvement in the status, income and living standards of the poorer groups in a society necessarily involves losses to other groups. Diminution of power and influence, diminution of property, and diminution of income are the prices the better off have to pay for the amelioration of the lot of the poor. They do not pay them willingly and may even resist them violently. Accordingly, the institutions of society are constructed to preserve and even enhance the privileges of the fortunate. Hence, any development which does not involve the restructuring of these institutions can only be trivial.

We accept much of the argument. The uneven development that has occurred through the world within and between countries and the growing disparities between rich and poor in many countries indicate that the new wealth and possibilities of greater welfare which have been created have accrued more to the rich and powerful and much less to the poor and weak. At the same time, however, the lot of the poor has not everywhere remained static or worsened. At the most basic level, before human life can improve, it has to exist. There are very few countries where the life expectancy at birth has not increased over the last 30 years. Similarly, there are very few countries where rates of infant and child mortality have not decreased.

Averages can of course be gravely misleading. Nevertheless, since the poor and the worse off form such very large proportions of the populations of developing countries, significant improvements in the average life expectancy and infant mortality can appear only if there have been improvements among the poor also. Remaining alive is not trivial. It has often been possible, then, despite oppression, inequality and deprivation, to achieve some general betterment in a fundamental matter.

Similar points could be made about subsistence food production, nutrition, health, schooling (the benefits or otherwise of which could be further discussed) and communications. None of these is trivial. Yet the learning which has been necessary for the improvements has taken place, whether or not the prevailing institutions of societies have been actively sympathetic. The learning may or may not have been organised by government or other agencies; it may have occurred as a spontaneous response to need and opportunity. Even so, it has occurred. Our argument is that the evidence suggests that it is worthwhile to continue thinking about learning for development. Most societies, whatever the habits of their rich and ruling classes, show spaces where people can learn to improve their lives without involving bloody revolution. An appropriate illustration is provided by a small training programme which took place in 1976. It concerned training change agents for development. The language of its report, (Bhasin, 1977) uses terms like 'critical awareness', 'liberation', 'feudo-militaristic élites'. Its participants recounted first-hand

cases where attempts to assist peasants improve their economic position were met by threats and physical violence. But they also recounted cases of improved water supplies, fish-pond development, better health services, which had not been hindered and all of which involved training and learning. Two features of these participants are notable. First, they all wanted to continue their work in rural development, even though no change in the 'feudo-militaristic elites' could be hoped for. Second, they came from four countries, three of which would rank high on most people's lists for oppression, corruption, inequality and mismanagement. In short,

> bad situations are seldom hopeless. Opportunities for worthwhile thinking, learning and training can almost always be identified and even created.

In the strictly educational sphere, we note a trend of thought, which, perhaps through overstatement only, appears to pursue an extreme argument about what worthwhile education is. Briefly, it appears to propose that any educational programme, which takes as its concern solely the transmission of knowledge and skills, is deficient and undeserving of the name 'education'. 'True' education must treat the learners as <u>subjects</u>, not <u>objects</u>, as people who should direct their own development, not as chattels to be developed according to the direction of others. 'True' education must help the learners achieve for themselves, first, a <u>critical awareness</u> of the factors in their environment which oppress them, and then, an appreciation of what cooperative but self-reliant action would be necessary to overthrow the oppression. 'True' education must lead to <u>self-actualisation</u>,

to the learners' discovering the powers and capacities latent in them, by which they can take firmer control of their environment and realise their own potential more fully. The mere transmission of knowledge and skills is not only imperfect education, it is potentially oppressive, in that it imposes on the learner other people's judgements of what is or is not worth learning for development.

Again, we accept much of the argument and we acknowledge the dangers of foisting alien and unnecessary knowledge and concepts upon people. What we reject is the implicit devaluation of knowledge and skills. It is in our view perfectly legitimate and adequate to train a person in the use of irrigation and fertilisers or in less wasteful ways of preparing food for a family, without simultaneously attempting a broader education in civics and self-awareness. We have a certain faith in the learner: if what is offered for learning is irrelevant, inappropriate, inapplicable or plain absurd, the learner simply will not learn. S/he will, in plain words, be turned off. Further, to take so restricted a view of what is worthwhile is to restrict the potential range of learning resources. For, if a master craftsman is to be discouraged from passing on his craft, unless he does it through critical awareness and self-actualisation, from where will his apprentices learn their skills? Our view then is that, while the objectives of 'true' education are indeed valid and desirable for all educators to strive for, they are not necessary conditions for all educational programmes.

DEFINITIONS

This section is intended to make plain what we see as development and education in fairly concrete, reasonably observable terms. It will accordingly display our own values and prejudices and should enable our readers to judge our consistency and to define more easily where they agree with or diverge from us. We would suggest that readers refer to it only when they wish to remind themselves of what we mean by a word or phrase.

1. Coordination, Integration - we take these two words together because, unlike many words which come into fashion, they have endured for at least a couple of decades. They tend, like heavenly twins, to keep each other company. Indeed, integration can hardly occur unless coordination precedes it, though coordination can exist without integration.

Coordination can, first, mean as little as people arranging not to get in each others' way, e.g. not arranging two meetings for the same villagers at the same time but in different places. Or, second, it can mean a lot of people making sure that their separate efforts towards a single objective are in mutual support and not mutually counteractive. For example, to get a batch of people vaccinated, the vaccinators need to have coordinated their plans both with the people concerned - so the latter know when to be where and can indeed be there - and with the suppliers of vaccines, antiseptics and the rest, so that when the vaccinators and the people get together, vaccinations can actually take place. In this instance, coordination comes close to integration, which in its root meaning implies wholeness or unity. Third, it may denote the need for people involved

in tasks which may relate to each other or even overlap, but which are normally executed independently, to keep each other well informed about their doings. This should avoid 'wasteful duplication'. Suppose a Village Development Committee builds a feeder road to a main bus stop. Would it not be mortified to find the Roads Department putting in a similar, perhaps better, amenity three months later?

From another angle, coordination can mean several subordinates working together on a goal set by a superordinate. Ten subordinates of a football team are coordinated by a superordinate, the captain, precisely in order to maximise goals. But coordination can also mean voluntary intercommunication, cooperation or mutual facilitation between independent equals. When a literacy programme decides that it must operate only where agricultural extension programmes are already operating, it is coordinating its effort with the agricultural programme voluntarily, but probably i the hope of facilitating both agriculture and literacy.

For our part, when we employ 'coordination', we shall, if necessary indicate which kind we mean for a particular case.

Integration is a rather more ambitious term than coordination. It may be used to imply that all aspects of a set of goals should be delineated as a whole and that all the activities of all the participants should so intermesh as to achieve that whole. It may also be used to imply that all the possible consequences of a set of actions should be foreseen and, if necessary, forestalled or in some way provided for. For instance, raising the incomes of the poorest groups through a new mode of agriculture may enable the adoption of better housing. At the same time, because of the expense of the housing materials, it may also lead to smaller houses and hence to deteriorating housing or increasing homelessness among the aged. The family structure for support and security may in effect be eroded. In regard to rural development, integration means attempting to comprehend the aspects of production, income, food, health, housing, education, communication, transport, political and property structures within one programme to be executed jointly by several agencies.

In a latter section we shall discuss the issues of coordination and integration in rather more detail. For the present we shall be careful when we use the words.

2. Development - in spelling out here what we would like to see in rural development, we shall use the abbreviation i.i.e. it stands for 'increasing and increasingly equal ..... by/in/among/for all social groups'. Also, we shall specify our criteria in an ascending order from plain survival to basic needs as currently conceived to what we might call richer self-actualisation. Our specifications apply alike to rural and urban populations, of course, but the people we have in mind are those who live in mainly agrarian communities.

- decreasing infant and child mortality in all social groups
- i.i.e. life expectancy
- at least sufficient quantities and varieties of food produced locally to provide diets adequate to maintain good health and sound physiological development
- i.i.e. access to and utilisation of clean water supplies
- i.i.e. access to housing which assists the maintenance of physical and psychological health
- decreasing incidence of illness and the eradication of preventable diseases like bilharzia, malaria, hookworm, dysentery
- increasing cash income to buy necessities which cannot be produced within the family or acquired by local barter
- discarding dietary habits which either do not make the most of local food resources or are actuallyharmful to health
- spread of habits of hygiene which reduce vulnerability to disease
- increasingly sufficient, stable and secure livelihoods accessible to all social groups
- increasing diversification of livelihoods

- increasingly sufficient, stable and secure livelihoods accessible to all social groups
- increasing diversification of livelihoods
  - i.i.e. access to and utilisation of appropriate and ever improving education-and-training programmes
  - i.i.e. access to and utilisation of steadily improving health services
  - i.i.e. access to those forms of transport and communication which enable participation in the larger society
  - increasing concern by the personnel of state agencies to serve <u>all</u> their public as effectively as possible
  - i.i.e. utilisation of services provided by the state
  - i.i.e. influence on the agencies, programmes and services provided by the state
  - i.i.e. participation by all social groups in decisions which affect them
  - increasing opportunities for developing talent and i.i.e. access to and utilisation of them, ('talent' includes capacity for transmitting and developing cultural expression)
  - i.i.e. access to and utilisation of easy and clean fuel and energy
- decreasingly oppressive conditions of work, (including house-work) for all social groups
- i.i.e. enjoyment of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the United Nations in the Declaration of Human Rights.

We should state our belief that the phrase 'increasingly equal' can be realised, only if deliberate care is taken to ensure that the poorest groups are enabled to make fair use of the opportunities created by governments and other agencies. The provision of 'equal opportunity' implies measures to equalise ability to respond to opportunity. Deliberate care and effort are required simply because of the iron law of social gra "To him who has shall even more be given". The physical law of gravity is overcome by many methods from tables to jet propulsion. Similar recognition, ingenuity and resourcefulness are required to counteract its social counterpart.

3. Education-and-Training - we do not wish to enter a discussion on whether there are distinctions to be drawn between education and training. We are as interested in programmes which unambitiously try to impart simple knowledge and skills as in those the prime aims of which are to induce new consciousness about social and political realities and new awareness of what will be needed to improve them. Accordingly, education-and-training will denote programmes which are organized to bring about some new learning which will be expressed in some desired behaviour. The organisers of such programmes may be servants of governments or they may work for voluntary agencies. Their programmes may for example be primary schools, or day-long courses for cattle owners, or campaigns to get people vaccinated against smallpox, or literacy classes aimed at stirring up resistance against oppressive economic and political traditions.

4. Local Elites. In general usage this has become a pejorative cliche. Our use of it is descriptive, referring to those rural dwellers who are in various combinations, more prosperous or at least less poor, better educated, and more influential. They are also typically those people who have travelled more and who have closer links with the world outside their own rural community.

5. Participation. In its root meaning, participation means 'taking part in'. How one can take part in an undertaking can of course take various forms - a spectrum of possibilities. From the individual's point of view, one pole is taking part under coercion and under orders with no say at all in either the objectives or procedures of the enterprise. The opposite pole is taking part as sole maker of objectives and decisions and sole givers of orders. In between, there can be various balances of subordination, equality and superordination.

For our purposes we shall use six phrases and underline them when they appear.

Full-participation indicates a situation where all the participants have freely come together over a commonly and spontaneously perceived concern, have freely and jointly decided what, if anything, should be done and have freely organized the doing between themselves. Full-participation is a polar ideal, perhaps seldom attained.

Catalysed-participation occurs when a matter of concern is first identified by one person or a few people. Subsequently, through deliberate enquiry, discussion and perhaps research by

these people, the matter becomes a concern for a larger group, which then freely organizes itself for action. Catalysed-participation is the ideal for educators in the tradition of Community Development and, more recently, 'Conscientization'.

Persuaded-participation is brought about by one person or a few people who identify a problem, then actively persuade a larger group to share their concern and later to take action about it. It can of course be accompanied by incentives, as when prospective participants in improved home building schemes are offered subsidies for roofing materials and door and window frames. Persuaded-participation is possibly the most common form found in programmes of education-and-training.

Pseudo-participation is to be found where a group of people are ostensibly running an operation for themselves, but are in fact having their work done for them by agents not of their own choosing nor even of their own employ. Examples can be found in a number of cooperative ventures, which are started and sustained by government agencies.

Representative-participation refers to the case common in forms of government, where groups elect some of their members to take decisions and action for them and, if required, participate in operations deemed necessary, e.g. paying dues and taxes.

Subordinating-participation occurs when a matter of concern is identified by one person or a few people. Subsequently, through pressure or coercion a larger group is induced to adopt both the concern and the measures proposed for dealing with it.

THE PROBLEM.

The governments of most developing countries believe that socioeconomic development can be promoted and accelerated by direct intervention by themselves. Some put much reliance on private entrepreneurs, whether local or international; some prefer to exclude private efforts to the greatest degree possible. Still, nearly all would agree that some intervention by the state, either through indirect support or through direct action is crucial to building the momentum of development.

The direct interventions take broadly three major forms. There are, first, state enterprises, expected to generate wealth and to make profits. There are, second, the agencies which extend the physical infrastructure for development, like roads, electricity and telecommunications. The third category, with which this monograph is concerned, comprises the services which need to work with lay-people in order to fulfil their own objectives. They are intended to help people increase production and productivity, to help ensure that increased production leads to increased incomes, to improve the health of communities, to educate communities in various ways for various purposes, to enable people to participate in the local and national political processes. We shall term them people-services. Departments of agricultural extension, community development, schools, health education are all examples.

Typically, these people-services have three mandates.

First, because the institutions or agencies of the people-services are specialists and experts, and because they are expected to bring about changes in their learner populations, they are expected also to generate appropriate initiatives for development. While times have certainly changed from the days when the agencies were expected to think up all the projects and plans for development, nevertheless the bulk of the responsibility for good ideas still lies with them. Their first mandate remains to be a spear-head of development.

Second, governments have long realised that, because they often serve the same people, the people-services should not act completely independently of each other. Their efforts should be coordinated at least to the point of avoiding wasteful duplication of effort and generating distraction and confusion among the people. Hence, a second mandate for the people-services is that they should coordinate with each other and, where appropriate, cooperate as closely as possible. In most governments, formal steps have been taken to try to ensure such coordination: some of them will be considered later in some detail. It is enough first to note that coordination is something recognised as desirable and actively sought.

Third, governments have long recognised that, those who are intended to learn from the people-services, must somehow be enabled to take part in the services themselves. Accordingly a third mandate is that the people services must enlist the acceptance and cooperation of their client populations. If possible, they should bring about such participation as will give the people actual influence in shaping, if not initiating the programmes of the

people-services.

If these three mandates were fully realised in an ideal world, the situation would appear roughly as follows. Programmes and projects would be thought of by personnel in any position in the people-services, but perhaps more by those close to the population served and less by those at the national centre of government or international agencies. More important, they would also be suggested by people in the populations themselves for themsevles and even possibly with notions on how they themselves could contribute to realising their ideas. There would be consultation and discussion between members likely to be affected. Once general agreement had been reached on a project or programme, the people-services would arrange for those of their personnel most in touch with the population concerned to team up appropriately with the population in order to bring the programme to fruition. The necessary support in expertise, labour and material would be made both available and easily accessible and schedules would be met. In effect, a national development plan would be largely composed of, if not dominated by, a myriad of local development plans.

In the real world, of course, the three mandates are neither fully nor equally honoured. People-services do take initiatives, do have ideas, do introduce new projects and new programmes. The majority of these initiatives, however, tend to flow from the national centres and not from regional provincial or district offices, still less from units as small, as, say, an agricultural extension station. Indeed, it has been remarked (Holtham and Hazlewood, 1976). that proposals from the smallest units closest to the

populations served, tend to be for things like an extra vehicle or higher rates of subsistence allowances. On the other hand, the proposals (and instructions!) which issue from the national centre often come in such rapid succession that they eventually bury each other (Chambers 1974, p.66). The first mandate - to be a spearhead of development - can appear to be over-fulfilled, but in such a way as to be not only nearly self-defeating, but in conflict with the second mandate - of coordination - as well.

The very volume of proposals will bias the personnel of people-services to focus on their own services and to give less priority to working jointly with other people-services. This is only one factor in explaining why cooperation between agencies appears to be such a difficult thing to manage. For it <u>is</u> difficult and rarely found to be sustained. Coordination between the plans, programmes and actions of the people-services tends to be mostly at the most superficial plane, that of not getting in each others' way. The widespread tendency is that people-services are each sealed off in their own compartments of activity and operate much more independently than interdependently. It has been known, too, for one people-service to help set up an Area Development Committee, while another, in the same area, has organised an Agricultural Development Committee with a different set of people. The result may be not merely compartments but rivalry and conflict. Where such compartmentalisatin is extreme, the efforts to stimulate learning for development become fragmented.

The forces which bring about compartmentalisation and fragmentation will be diagnosed a little later. For the present, let us look at the state of implementing the third mandate, that of encouraging the support, cooperation, participation and initiative of the populations to be served.

The field is, so to speak, strewn with isolated successes, half-successes, failures and new ventures which cannot yet easily be evaluated. Communities have certainly demanded schools for their children, built schools either at the suggestion of a people-service or at their own initiative, willingly paid fees and contributed to the salaries of the school-teachers. They have even built health-centres, roads and markets. In places, there have been village cooperatives which have prospered and flourished (e.g. Bavisker, 1978) and women's clubs which have not only helped improve family life and health, but have also opened up new sources of family income. Certainly, agricultural production by small farmers for both subsistence and marketing has been improved and increased in many places.

It is also true that there are a number of examples of successful organisations like Village Development Committees, which have taken charge of and advanced the development of their

communities. All this has naturally involved education-and-training in one mode or another. Nevertheless, despite the array and variety of successes in obtaining popular participation and initiative (particularly in one or two countries which have chosen to discourage individual enterprise), the weight of experience with this third mandate has been disappointin

Perhaps the most widespread finding is that participation, like coordination, is very difficult to sustain. In a very elementary way, an illustration is the rate of dropout from the rural primary school of many countries. Participation here should be the easiest to sustain, if only because the direct and indirect costs are probably lower than participation in other forms of learning and activity. Then, too, there is a people-service devoted full-time to running the school, with a ratio of personnel to user-population which is the highest of all the people-services. Primary school-teachers operate on the basis of one to perhaps sixty pupil/families at most. Few are the countries which can afford one agricultural extension or cooperative worker to 1,000 farm families, let alone sixty! Finally, parents are willing to go to the lengths of building schools and paying teachers in order to get their children some schooling; yet, even so, many allow their children to drop out long before the school has had much effect. If maintaining participation in educational programmes for children is difficult, it is much more so in the case of adults. Adult literacy programmes, usually over-subscribed when they open, are soon reduced in numbers. Even in UNESCO's Experimental World Literacy Programme, which was thoughtfully and carefully prepared, their rates of dropout or broken off participation were in excess of 60 per cent. (UNESCO 1976)

Taking participation beyond simply utilising opportunities for learning, we can note that producer cooperatives in agriculture have a very mixed history. They often owe their continued existence less to the effort and devotion of their members and more to the control and support of the government's people-services. Village Development Committees appear to tend to have spasms of successful action on a specific project or set of projects, then to lapse into inaction and ineffectualness. The current decline and disrepute of Community Development programmes is a symptom of this tendency. There seems to be limited scope for village groups to continue setting goals and learning how to achieve them with the help of the people-services.

Another aspect of the failure to gain participation en masse has been noted only relatively recently. While all members of communities often participate in a development project, the longer term benefits of the work invested appear to accrue not to the whole community but rather to the better off groups within it.

In the schools, for instance, the children of the more prosperous tend to persevere longer and do better. In the women's clubs, it is the wives of the more influential men who seem to be able to take most advantage of the assistance offered by the government. In agricultural extension, the more prosperous, go-ahead farmers who require least help in learning, attract most of the

attention of the extension agents and most of the materia- help as well. Community development self-help housing schemes are adopted by those with the money to buy the necessary tin and timber. In other words, to the extent that participation is sustained, it is sustained by the more able groups in communities. It leads thus to greater communal differentiation and inequality (and possibly commun conflict) rather than to equal development for all members of the It is argued even worse that the very responsiveness of the more able groups, by yielding the appearance of progress, masked the inability of the less able -- often a majority -- to utilise the opportunities on offer, led to their being overlooked and neglected, and hence deepened their underdevelopment.

Our problem is then, that the people-services of too many governments are not succeeding in fulfilling their three major mandates to a satisfactory degree. New ideas and initiatives emanate too frequently from the national centre, too seldom from the lower echelons, and least of all from those in daily contact with the people to be served. The people-services tend to seal themselves in the compartments of their own activities, to fragment their offerings to the people and to cooperate with each other only sporadically and on ad hoc bases. Finally, the user populations respond to the people-services disappointingly. They tend to neglect opportunities proffered, to abandon what they start, to be diffident in contributing ideas and unwilling to take control

of their own development. The exceptions which can be set against this despondent summary -- and there are indeed a number -- are neither numerous enough nor apparently so easily replicable as to provide models for easily changing the situation. Too often, the outcome is that programmes of education-and-training for rural people seem to have only a faint impact on development.

The next section of this monograph will attempt to clarify why this should be so.

THE PROBLEM ANALYSED.

Organisational Structure and Behaviour.

The language of the summary of the problem may have suggested that the fault for failure lies at the door of certain people. The men and women in the ministries are to blame for generating too many new instructions too often, besides answering letters too slowly and too seldom! Behind them, perhaps, stand the men and women from the international aid organisations, who live by stimulating new and possibly contradictory instructions. The men and women in the lower echelons are also to blame for failing to cooperate with each other. And finally of course the populations to be served seem to be excessively lethargic in grasping the opportunities to learn better and fuller ways of living. In a way, people are to blame. However, the insinuations of the summary are altogether too simple. This section will examine instead the bases on which the people - services are usually constructed, their implications for operation, and their compatibility with the three mandates. A later section will enquire about the three mandates. themselves: are they mutually compatible and, if so, under what conditions?

Our operational indicators of development in the second section make clear the multi-dimensional nature of improving human life. They introduce us to the heart of our problem. The purpose of education-and-training programmes is in the end to enable the single individual to incorporate a multi-tude of ideas, questions, and recommendations in construct-

ing a pattern of life that is more satisfying. But these ideas do not come from a single source. The simplest distillations which reach the lay individual are made possible only by large bodies of theory, knowledge, skill and experiment which precede them. These bodies or areas are themselves manageable only by specialists and even then only when subdivided between several cadres of specialists. The problem then is that, while the single individual is the final focus of development and of education-and-training for it, the content of education-and-training has to be drawn from several sources. The task is to draw from these sources in combinations which answer the individual's needs to learn and, in addition, fit his or her convenience and capacities.

Structure of the People-Services.

The education-and-training programmes of the people-services have been the almost universal approach to this task. They are a compromise between the diversity of what is available for learning and the singleness of the learner. For instance, a Ministry of Agriculture may have divisions for research, experiment and marketing, working across the whole range of crops, soils, fertilizers, pests and so on; but its division for extension training will deal in only a narrow section of these interests in any given geographical area. Despite focusing expertise through a relatively few educator-trainers, the total range of a government's activities may end up with half a dozen different specialists all expected to give education-and-training to a given population.

Now this response can be viewed as an example of the rational division of labour. Specialisation on one of several tasks involved in the production of an article

enhances productivity and reduces costs, as Adam Smith noted in the manufacture of pins. If no one person can handle advising on all aspects of development as they affect a community, a family or an individual, it makes sense that the aspects should be separated out into relatively coherent fields, each made the province of a particular group of specialis

The analogy is not wholly valid, of course. To be fully effective, the division of labour in industrial terms requires a single, standardised end product. All the sub-jobs preceding the product contribute patently towards it. The processes of inducing rural development, however, are very little like those of an industrial production line: while certain states may indeed strive for a certain degree of standardisation in outlook and behaviour, no state at present is attempting to produce automatons in its rural communities. Indeed, the only people-service which comes near the production line in nature is the school. The end product of a sequenced process is a graduate who is expected to have reached certain standards in specified skills and to have adopted certain values regarding his role in society.

Even so, it remains true that the various people-services are attempting to promote and facilitate a fairly standard package of benefits and improvements. Each tries to insert its own contribution to a common goal of many components. Industrial division of labour calls for a form of organisation which ensures careful planning, strict coordination and sequencing of inputs and operations, relentless supervision and quality control. By contrast, the organisation adopted by most governments for their people-services is actually biased against an ffective division of labour among specialist To say this is to allege that the way the people-services are

organised, actually carries further the tendency to compartments and fragments which is, as noted, implicit in the usual organisation of knowledge and research.

The prevailing structure of governments - by specialised function - is essentially that which was set up, when governments saw themselves not as engines and even prime movers of development, but merely as administrative, regulatory or simple executive mechanisms. On that view, it was entirely sensible to organise a ministry of agriculture on much the same basis as a ministry of finance. Ministries and departments were after all conceived as agencies to get things done themselves, not to help others to learn to do them. Grouping those things so that they presented reasonably coherent packets of related functions made sense.

These functions required more or less specialised knowledge to be done properly.* Naturally, their exponents developed professional fields of expertise and not unreasonably judged that the functions could be handled only by those suitably qualified or, in case of need, by less qualified persons trained and supervised by the fully or at least better qualified. Accordingly, the execution of the functions came to be managed through hierarchies of expertise. The most qualified tended to do the most responsible functions, while the least qualified undertook those requiring the least

---

*We have to make an exception here of the function of higher administration, which was in many places regarded within the capability of any well educated person.

knowledge and skills. Along with this, the most rewarded functionaries tended to collect at the centres of government, while the least rewarded were distributed to the minor outposts. This coincidence of qualification, position in a hierarchy and geographical posting is an important factor, which will recur a little later. It is important, too, to note here that the qualifications of expertise pertained to knowing and doing things. They did not - except in the cases of the schools and special institutions of training - pertain primarily to helping other people understand why and how to do them as well. Still less did they pertain to understanding whether what the specialist knew was wholly appropriate to the people expected to learn from him.

This pattern of administration and execution continued to be tenable under the first conceptions of development, when it became a deliberate undertaking of governments. Development was first viewed largely as coordinated sets of investment, mobilisation, organisation, action. This is as true of Japan and Soviet Russia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centures - and of Turkey, Ghana and Iran a little later - as it is of those countries whose deliberate development was launched around the mid-twentieth century. Appropriate action naturally called for appropriate specialists in supporting services from centre to outposts. This arrangement was logical, so long as the actions of the agencies were sufficient by themselves to engineer development. It w adequate, for instance, for a department of roads, whose tasks were complete, when a road was built and provision made

for its maintenance. The question for us here is whether it was similarly adequate for a people-service which depended for its effectiveness on getting people in masses to learn new attitudes, behaviours, techniques.

The issue of learning here has two aspects. Insofar as it was required to produce the specialists themselves, its necessity was acknowledged by all governments. The investments in human capital, as it has been called, to provide the skilled manpower for development have been huge, reaching their peaks in the early years of this decade and levelling off only during the mid-seventies. The bulk of these expenditures has gone into schools, technical colleges and universities. They have gone mainly to prepare people - mostly men - to fit into the functional hierarchies. A very much smaller proportion has been devoted to in-service training - to make the fit even better. The effect has been, of course, to perpetuate specialisation within compartments of functions.

The second aspect of learning has received rather less in the way of resources. It is the learning that the masses have to do in order to take full advantage of the people-services. An important distinction has to be made here between governments who declared themselves to be on 'socialist' courses and those who preferred market economies modified by state intervention. The former have been much more sensitive to the issue of mass education and have devoted much energy and many resources to it. Even so, the structures of their people-services have not been very different from those of the second group.

If development had been viewed from the beginning as a process which would involve total populations and single individuals in learning along several dimensions simultaneously, and if governments had not already had long established agencies in place with obvious functions in development, it is possible that different structures would have evolved to organise and support the learning required. As it happened, the existing division of labour by function was merely extended to cater for learning components: agricultural ministries set up extension departments, health ministries either set up health education agencies or let their specialist arms set up programmes in nutrition, family planning, mother-and-child care education, departments of community development tried to cover what other departments had omitted. There came a proliferation of agencies whose job was to get the masses of the people - especially the masses who had not obtained any schooling and who lived for the most part in the rural areas - to learn to act for development.

Attempted Reforms Within Structures:

The awkwardnesses of this arrangement were rapidly perceived and measures of various sorts were introduced to overcome them. India, for instance, introduced the Block Development pattern, which aimed at 'coordinating' the work of all the people-services for a population of some 100,000 under the direction of a Block Development Officer. On a smaller scale, the Panchayat Raj (Village Government) was intended both to ensure that the people-services were properly directed as far as the village was concerned, and

to provide the base from which villages could learn to direct their own development and to utilise the people-to even better advantage. The countries of East and Central Africa introduced the Provincial, District and Area Development Teams. Under the chairmanship of the senior central government administrator - a Provincial or District Commissioner - the technical departments and representatives of local government bodies were required to develop programmes in which they jointly supported each other. In Turkey, the provincial governors found themselves chairing no less than 50 odd committees in the effort to ensure that government's development programmes were 'coordinated'.

From the other direction, village to government, the community development movement enjoyed a vogue from 1947 onward - until its heyday in the early 1960's; since when widespread disappointment has led to decline and decreasing reliance on it.

In between government coordination and popular initiative, India attempted to mitigate the confusion of a plethora of agencies competing for attention: the multipurpose Village Level Worker was tried out. This person was trained by all the people-services to carry all their messages to the people. The device has not been highly successful. These examples are of course taken from the states which have adopted largely market economies and have not pursued a strong central ideology through a single political party. None of them has been conspicuously successful.

The 'socialist' states rely upon a single well organised political party operating through from centre to least outpost to help their people-services transmit their messages and exhortations. However, it is not incontestably clear that this device has been generally and greatly more effective than those employed in more pluralist societies.

Reasons For Failure.

How can one account for the facts that the severe drawbacks of the existing way of operating have been acknowledged for at least thirty years; that much ingenuity has been devoted to overcoming them; and that no satisfactory solution to them has yet been devised? One path towards understanding the puzzle might be to note that all the mechanisms so far attempted have been efforts to trim a pattern to fit a purpose for which it was not originally intended. They have essentially accepted three ancient assumptions.

First, compartments of functions based on specialised knowledge must remain the structure for people-services. Second, the functions must be arranged in a hierarchy which has its most junior, least responsible and least remunerated functionaries in the furthest flung outposts and its most senior and most powerful positions at the national centre. Third, the hierarchy of authority and decision-making must correspond to the hierarchy of specialised knowledge. For instance, an agricultural extension worker must be responsible primarily to a senior agricultural extension worker, in turn responsible to, say, a district agricultural officer, in turn responsible to a regional agricultural officer, in turn responsible to a state agricultural director, and so on. The subsidiary assumption here is that any arrange-

ment which diverts this flow of authority, such as a District Development Committee or even a Regional Development team, must accept a lower priority in the workings of the specialist department. So, if a District Team needs a certain community development village worker to continue a project, but the larger Regional Community Development Department needs the same person to open a new project, the likelihood is that the Region will get the worker and the District will have to adjust its projects to find some way of coping with the added problem of the loss of an experienced staff member.

The way these assumptions have been stated presupposes a unitary national state with insignificant agencies of local government. However, the essentials remain true also of federal states, such as India or Mexico, or of unitary states, like Indonesia, which devolve much responsibility to their provinces and municipalities. For, however small the tier of government and however restricted its people-services, they seem always to be organised hierarchically, with the most senior personnel at the centre of government and the most junior in the outposts.

Autonomy and Boundaries.

The first assumption, that functions are to be organised round specialised knowledge, tends to reinforce two human biases, one inimical to coordination between specialist departments, the second inimical to full-participation by the people. It is a widespread observation that a large proportion of the human race prefers to operate with as much

autonomy and independence as possible and with as little interference from others as can be managed. This bias toward autonomy has its counterpart in what we may term a 'respect for boundaries': because a man wants others to keep out of his field of expertise, he agrees to keep out of theirs. The fact that a group of persons have specialised knowledge that is institutionalised and legitimised in the form of a specialist department deepens the bias towards insisting that persons without such knowledge should refrain from attempting to direct their activity. While a specialist may be more than willing to put his knowledge at the disposal of someone else in need of it, he will probably be less than willing to take orders - or even suggestions - on what to do with it himself. This bias of course helps to explain much of the difficulty encountered by generalist administrators with responsibility for coordinating technical departments - a difficulty compounded by the perhaps unstated feeling that to accept coordination is to acknowledge subordination, or a loss of autonomy in one's own field.

Expertise and Authoritarianism.

As regards full-participation, we recall that a government working for the development of rural populations has normally judged that its people do not know precisely and so need to learn what is required for their own development. By providing specialist people-services, it necessarily implies that they have the expertise which the people lack and must transmit it to the people. So, the people "to be developed" start out on an unequal footing. The natural corollary is that the concept of participation contains much more of a bias towards experts

knowing what is needed and having to get the less knowledgeable people to understand and to undertake it, towards, in short, persuaded-participation. There is necessarily much less inclination towards letting those "to be developed" help identify what is needed and work out the way towards it. The fairly strong human bias towards authoritarianism is legitmised and reinforced through the explicit authority of professional expertise.

This relationship of inequality in expertise is of course entrenched through the inequalities of resources, status, education, salary and standard of living. The point is most easily illustrated by agricultural development schemes, where participation by people is stringently conditional on the adoption of specified guidelines. Credit can be made available, only if certain crops are grown with certain planting and weeding techniques and the use of certain pesticides and fertilisers. The person who lays down the conditions and transmits the knowledge also has advantages in being educated, salaried and secure in employment. Consequently the indeliberate bias toward subordinating-participation is increased

The tendency of the second and third assumption is to add to the biases of the first. The second, it will be recalled, supposed the necessity that each specialist people-service be ordered in a pyramid of authority, responsibility and power. The effect is that the operations of the people -

services are conducted by a set of such pyramids. Each has its own peak, each controls a major budget of its own, disposes its own personnel and constructs its own policies within broad guides agreed by whatever happens to form the peak of peaks - a president, a prime minister-in-cabinet. Such a structure very plainly militates against both inter-departmental coordination and full-participation. Insofar as coordination is touched, as higher levels of pyramids are involved, so too are greater interests of status, autonomy and boundaries. A provincial director of education, for instance, needs reassurances that his staff's priorities - set by him and his superiors - are not being disordered by a district general administrator. A superior may be more affronted by the attempt of another people-service to give orders to his subordinates, than his subordinates themselves.

Further, the higher up the pyramid a person is stationed, the greater is the pressure on him or her to produce initiatives. It is easier to have them accepted and implemented, when one is working within the boundaries of a single department, than when one needs to seek the assent of others, or, even more difficult, when one needs to get the cooperation of their personnel.

The assumption of the necessity of a hierarchy makes it also more of a struggle to achieve full-participation. The age-old dynamic of human relations within a pyramid of authority disinclines an upper layer from taking orders from a lower. The upper may call for information, suggestions, ideas: it seldom thinks it can learn from below, still less will it welcome instructions on what might be done. It may accede to requests, but does not receive demands kindly. These features may be less marked in societies where egalitarian and democratic ethics are strong, but their general force remains. If, then, full-participation requires that decisions be made at what is currently the bottom of all the pyramids, it runs counter to the constitutional grain of a pyramid - except where the decisions involve only trivial proportions of the pyramid's resources and personnel.

Similarly, the third assumption that the hierarchy of increasing authority must correspond with increasing specialist expertise, entrenches the bias against full-participation, precisely by legitimising inequality of power through inequality of expertise. The people at the bottom can always be outflanked because the people further up claim to know better. Conversely, the bias towards subordinating-participation is also entrenched, because the proposals or amendments from further up the pyramid are armed with the presumption of greater expertise.

Trend of Accountability.

Taken together, the second and third assumptions incorporate two further biases against departmental coordination and full-participation. These are in the areas of accountability and of career advancement. The autonomy of each specialist pyramid

makes the personnel of a particular pyramid much more accountable to their own peers and superiors than to any coordinating or cooperating body. Even where, as in Turkey, the head of the coordinating agency is charged with signing the annual confidential reports of all government personnel in his area, the departmental heads draft the reports first. In any case, of course, they are responsible for the day-to-day programmes of their staff, while their superiors at higher levels can at any moment transmit new instructions, albeit through the coordinating agency, or even transfer them and their subordinates at a moment's notice.

More powerfully, the path of career advancement tends to lie not through coordinating agencies but through a specialist department. While functionaries of general administration, like clerks, accountants, or secretaries, can move about the administrations of several specialist departments, specialists themselves are much more restricted in the range of opportunities for promotion. They need to be successful more in the terms defined by their specialist superiors, and much less in terms proposed by coordinating agencies. Whatever the counteractive measures taken, then, the bias of accountability remains through the specialist department.

Naturally, also, the direction of accountability runs from lower to higher level within the pyramid. It does not run from superior to subordinate, neither does it run from specialist

to the outside laymen. The specialists of the people-services do not generally have to account for themselves to the people they are intended to service, nor are the people asked to pass judgement on the specialists. This in itself weakens the motivation to achieve full-participation or even catalysed-participation. The human tendency after all is to orient one's behaviour according to the criteria of merit laid down by those influential in one's preferment.

Direction of Incentive.

There is yet another effect of these assumptions, which is perverse in the case of the people-services. Even if the major goal of a people-service were simply to get the people to learn things determined solely by the service itself, it would seem logical that the staff best able to help people learn should be in as close and as constant contact with the people as can be arranged. That is, the incentives and rewards of the people-services should be so distributed as to induce those who best combined specialist expertise with effectiveness in communication to spend most of their careers in communication with learners. Such an arrangement would be expected even more, where people-services were required to conduct dialogue with their populations and to move to situations of full-participation. The greatest rewards should go to those who help the people to learn.

Most existing arrangements, to the contrary, systematically remove the best specialists from the people. Because the higher the level is in a pyramid, the more remove it is from constant intercourse with the people who need to learn; because the rewards of a career are arranged to induce staff to reach for the higher

levels and because the more qualified are placed immediately at one or more remove from the learners; it comes about that the prime learners - the rural populations - are left both with the least qualified specialists in terms of formal preparation and with either the newest and most junior or those so little effective that their removal by promotion is slow. This statement holds true not only of rural primary schools, but also of people-services like community development, literacy programmes or health education. In a word, the structures of authority, expertise and advancement work to defeat the goals of learning.=

Learning with the Least Qualified.

The more advanced goal of full-participation is threatened not merely by the reliance on the least equipped specialists to maintain contact with the learners, but also by the probability that the least equipped specialists are the most fearful about full-participation. It has been suggested (Beeby, 1966) that the confidence of school teachers and their willingness to undertake less authoritarian and didactic modes of instruction is a function of their own level of competence and knowledge. The surer they are of themselves, the more willing they become to permit their learners greater freedom of expression and questioning, and more scope for autonomous learning. Conversely, those teachers whose knowledge is only slightly ahead of their pupils' tend to be more rigid and authoritarian. Since full-participation would demand that specialists of the people-services adopt a consultative rather than a didactic stance, it can be suggested that the least

equipped specialists are least suited to promote full-participation.

It can also be argued that placing the least qualified at the point of contact with the learners militates against 'co-ordination' and 'integration' as well. (Before we develop this point, we should state that our thoughts here are based not upon systematic and validated research, but upon our own experiences and that of others - as the case study on 'The Training and Visit System of Agricultural Extension' illustrates. We speak then with diffidence and caution. We mean 'By and large .....','On the whole ....', 'Granting numerous exceptions and contradictory experiences .....') The specialists who are formally least trained and qualified, tend also to be those with the least experience of schooling. Whatever the faults of the school, it does seem that the less advanced an individual's experiences of its processes, the less developed are his or her abilities in three important ways:

First, s/he seems less able to grasp general concepts and principles and to be more dependent on particular, concrete examples. Relatedly, s/he seems less able to transfer the general principles deduced from one set of circumstances to another. Accordingly, third, s/he seems more comfortable with a very clearly structured and bounded job with a known number of tasks, where skills can be learned and applied by drill, routine, regular rhythm and little variation. S/he seems, conversely, less comfortable with open-ended jobs which call for both flexibility and imaginative response. At the same time, as Beeby suggests, s/he may be more sensitive about encroachments on his professional integrity and autonomy - simply because he has so little of either, that a small infringement is disproportionately damaging. This combination of

characteristics would indicate - if we are at all correct! - that, if the less schooled are to be used with learners, they would best be left with a restricted curriculum to communicate. They should not be asked to coordinate or cooperate with other people-services, except in the most rudimentary and limited ways - as the case study 'The Radio Learning Group Public Consultation .....' illustrates.*

In sum, this section has suggested that the bases on which people-services are currently structured contain serious inherent biases which counteract efforts towards executing the second and third mandates, those of promoting coordination between the people-services and full-participation with the learner populations. That is to say, the very organisation of the services for education-and-training contributes to the difficulties of organising education and training for rural development.

These biases of structure are exacerbated by three sets of factors. The first can be described as management pathology; the second is urban bias - the tendency for towns to be better served than rural areas; and the third is local elite bias - the tendency for the staff of rural services to interact with and serve mainly those who are already relatively better off.

Management Pathology: The Problems of Invisible Man.

The shortcomings of programmes of education and training in rural development are often conveniently attributed to deficiencies on the part of the lower levels of field staff. It is, after all, quite often at the field level that programmes go wrong. It is also easy, indeed tempting, for those responsible higher up in the organisation concerned to characterise those rather invisible agents of development - the village level workers, agricultural extension staff, community development workers, health staff, school teachers, animateurs of whatever sort, and local leaders - as being variously idle, ignorant, stupid and corrupt; or, more recently, with changing fashions, as unduly elitist and unconcerned with the rural poor. Senior officials may ask, rhetorically, how they can be expected to conduct an effective programme for adult literacy, or environ-

---

*We readily concede that the deficiencies we have noted may be remedied by well conceived training. Indeed, our first case study is an example of such an approach.

mental health, or family planning, or improved cultivation, or better nutrition, or child care, or self help, or primary school reform, when their front-line troops are ineffective. Blame is then followed by a blustering mixture of exhortation and threat, of calls to work harder and of penalties, if targets are not met.

This top-downwards and centre-periphery view of field staff is understandable. Senior officials and other short-term visitors to rural areas are exposed to conflicting evidence. On the one hand, their visits tend to show them the best, with tarmac bias (accessibility to urban centres), encounters limited to the rural elite, and seeing only the most progressive farmers, self-help groups, villages and schools. Such visits show them what can be achieved. But at the same time they usually know that what they are seeing is atypical and that elsewhere the situation is much less encouraging. Because they are often aware of False reporting and know that implementation is unsatisfactory, it is small surprise that such senior officials seek an explanation in the legligence, incompetence and dishonesty of field staff.

To blame field staff can, however, be misleading. It is true that like other people, they include some who are more industrious amd conscientious and some who are less so. But their behaviour can be understood as rational in terms of the managerial environment in which they find themselves. When social anthropologists or other social scientists have spent protracted periods in field situations they have tended to reveal a set of conditions of work for field staff which are at best difficult and at

worst intolerable. There appear to have been two common syndromes.

In the first, poor performance is linked with lack of a work programme, low incentives and little supervision. This appears to have been common in some parts of Africa (Cliffe et al 1968; Harrison 1969; Leonard 1977; Mbithi 1973; Moris 1972). A study of agricultural extension in 71 villages in Eastern Nigeria concluded that

> "Agricultural extension agents often live in villages under conditions that foster lethargy, with no meaningful communication with superiors, inadequate supervision and advice. All these factors create feelings of personal alienation and dislocation. Strategies to expand the efficiency and vitality of the extension service would have to include improvements in the interaction between change agent bureaucracy and extension agent in the village"
>
> (Hursh, Roling and Kerr 1968:159)

In this syndrome staff engaged in training and education programmes do rather little and do it rather ineffectively. The problem here initially is to identify and initiate useful tasks. But once this process is launched, the second syndrome is liable to take over.

This second syndrome is probably more common, especially in Asia, but also in parts of Africa, and is associated with situations of more rapid change or crisis. In it, field staff are flooded with demands on their time, both from higher levels in the bureaucracy and from their clients. An example taken from Latin America rings true for many parts of the world. In a sensitive analysis of the effectivenees of field staff in the Ministry of Agriculture in Peru, John Hatch states that "... <u>they are not doing their job of agricultural development effectively</u> (1976:218. His italics). But he continues:

" The fault is not their's. It is only prudent to recognize that there are excellent reasons why their performance does not comply with our expectations of them. As with most state agencies, the peruvian farm extension xxxxxxx service has not escaped the debilitating effects of bureaucratization. Office functions have gradually encroached on field functions: reports follow reports in an endless chain; yesterday's top priority from the Ministry is supplanted by today's urgent request; and tomorrow'sfield visit must wait until next week. During working hours the office of the Motupe extension agency is swarming with farmers - each with his own urgent problem requiring the extension agent's attention: a signature, a stamp of approval on a notarized document, an explanation for delayed credit, a letter to Agrarian Reform, a co-op crisis, a request for technical assistance, etc. If we consider that the Motupe office is responsible for a jurisdiction of 4 districts, with a combined populatic of 4916 farm units, it is easy to see that the potential clientele dependent on its services is far larger than can be even minimally attended. The office staff available to cover this ~~j~~ huge jurisdiction , consists of the extension agent, an administrative secretary, one veterinarian, and four sector technicians, all of whom must share a single, ailing, pick-up truck. Salary levels for all personnel are inadequate, and the possibilities of promotion or more remunerative employment elsewhere are virtually nil. Per-diems are non-existent, petty cash funds barely cover vehicle maintenance, and most travel costs for field visits must come out-of-pocket."

(ibid. p.219)

Hatch goes on to ask:

"Who has the time to prepare adequate credit feasibility studies, and to keep them updated? Who has the energy, and requisite"pull", to spend several hours each week investigating credit delays and expeditin more timely loan deliveries? Who has a light enough workload to educate and periodically supervise credit recipients once their loans arrive? Who is going to make frequent farm visits when each trip to the countryside requires more time spent waiting for public transportation or in walking to farms than in conversations with farmers? Who will be paid more than we presently receives for administering bold new services like soil testing, tube well inspections, and insect control xxxxxxxxx programs? and who is sufficiently free of the daily pressures and crises of contemporary program efforts to be able to evaluate objectively their inadequacies and suggest ways of improving their effectiveness? "

(ibid.219-220)

Much the same impressions have been given by accounts of the life and work of Village-Level Workers (VLWs) in India. Dubey et al. 1962 present some revealing case studies of VLWs, one of whom they report as saying (though with a certain and perhaps surprising serenity)

"The VLW is little better than a beast of burden. His pay is insignificant. I often get dictator type orders .... One villager says, 'my animal is sick; you must come treat it'. Another says, 'you haven't brought my fertilizer. Oh, there are so many things'.

(Ibid. 14)

In such situations a major problem for field staff is to ration and space the demands on their time so as to maintain reasonable relations locally and at the same time give a good impression to their superiors. A rational strategy is to concentrate attention on the most prosperous and most influential local people, both for the sake of peace and perhaps modest reward, and also because they can be useful allies in placating and impressing senior officers when they visit.

Generalisation which spans countries, regions, departments and programmes is bound to be precarious. All the same, some elements in these pathological conditions appear to be the following. Not all apply everywhere; and some are more common than others. But in diagnosing the problems of rural management for education and training, they may provide a useful checklist:

Checklist of Pathological elements.

(i) top-down targetry. Performance targets are set at higher levels in an administrative hierarchy and then disaggregated downwards. At the very bottom of the hierarchy this means that the lowliest field level worker is handed a target which he is expected to achieve. At first sight this system may seem sensible. In practice it is often self-defeating. It has been widely criticised (see for example Hunter 1970; Heginbotham 1953; and Mook 1974). In a trenchant attack, in the context of agricultural extension in India, Dandekar has written:

> "We witness the District and Block agricultural officers and the Extension workers under them running around with targets of agricultural production, crop by crop, targets of areas to be sown with improved seed, targets of areas to be brought under new minor irrigation, targets of green manuring and targets of compost pits to be dug. In all these cases the officers and Extension workers know full well that what they can do in the matter of achieving these targets is extremely limited, and final decisions lie with the farmers..... In consequence, a make-believe world is created in which targets are determined and progress reported in terms of items over which the parties concerned have no authority

> figures, and nevertheless everyone must engage himself in so much paper-work which is worse than wasteful - it is intellectually corrupting. This must stop."
>
> (Dandekar 1967, cited in Hunter 1970:63)

A condition can be created in which field level workers are expected to improve their performance, for example, in the adoption by farmers of high-yielding varieties of a crop, year by year. Since checking is virtually impossible, they prudently report, year by year, that the acreage has increased. In one case in South India, this led to reporting acreages under high yielding varieties of rice which were over three times that revealed by a careful and detailed micro-level survey (Chinnappa 1977:96) In another similar case in Bangladesh, the exaggeration was by a factor of five.

The costs are high. They include misleading information, deceit, low morale, and, paradoxically, low incentives to improve performance (since "achievement" of targets has little connection with what field staff do and "achievements" reported are not checked).

(ii) excessive reporting. As programme follows programme, so report follows report. As new staff are posted in at higher levels, so they demand new information. It may take only five minutes to draft a circular demanding data, but it may take thousands of man hours for a dispersed field staff to provide it. In practice, such demands are additive. New ones are added on, but old ones are not abolished. It is not unusual therefore to find field staff much of whose time is absorbed in making returns and reports. One VLW in India in the mid-1960s had to send the following regular reports:

1. Weekly advance tour programme
2. Weekly diary
3. Monthly progress report
4. Farm production plan - monthly statement
5. .... latrines - monthly statements
6. Progress report of agricultural activities (fortnightly)

as well as other occasional reports and schedules (Halse et. al. 1967) :32) In Sri Lanka in 1974, one agricultural instructor was required to submit 29 reports and returns a month, or 348 a year. The creation of a new ministry in Colombo to implement the food war generated a demand for more information at shorter intervals, much of it duplicating what was already reported. The effect was perverse: at a time of food crisis the food war became partly a paper war and extension staff were tied more than ever to their offices (Chambers and Wickremanayake 1977:163).

(iii) multiple programmes, multiple masters. Typically, tasks are given to field staff without an assessment of the time they have available to execute them. This can be serious even within a single ministry with a unified chain of command. In one case in Kenya it was found that the work required of the lowest level agricultural staff in one location varied, by month throughout the year, from 474 per cent to 18 per cent of the time they had available (Belshaw and Chambers, 1973). Partly this occurred because they were responsible for several programmes promoted by several different sections within the headquarters of the ministry. Indeed, the more entrepreneurial, enterprising and imaginative the staff are in headquarters, the more the field staff may be paralysed by overload, and the more one programme may be submerged and suffocated by its successor before it has had a chance. For example, a cotton extension programme in Mwanza District in Tanzania was, following successful pilot testing, about to be

carried out by all agricultural extension staff; but the programme was killed by the arrival of tractors as part of an aid programme which took priority for the introduction of block farming. Not only did the block farming fail, but the potential benefits of the cotton programme were lost, too.

The situation can be even more acute when field staff are responsible to several different masters. Some of the most extreme examples come from India in the late 1950s and in the 1960s, during the period when Village-Level Workers (VLWs) were expected to be multi-purpose. A study in Uttar Pradesh (PRAI (1958)) listed 25 tasks for which VLWs were responsible under the separate headings of agriculture (5), animal husbandry (3), public health (4), cooperatives (3), social education (6), panchayats (2), and community works (2). These included demonstrating improved varieties of seeds, manures, fertilisers and implements and making arrangements for their supply; arranging for the supply of improved breed cattle; popularising soakage pits; performing inoculations and vaccinations; organising new cooperative societies and reorganizing old ones; running literacy classes; attending and organising panchayat meetings; and sending progress reports on time (ibid. 67-68). Sometimes field staff simply declined to do additional work. For one Indian block it was reported of a meeting that the Cooperative Extension Officer asked VLWs to help in loan recoveries but that they refused since there were specialised staff already for this task (Halse et al: 1967:81).

Often, though, they may have been unable to refuse, and have had to accept the situation. One VLW was reported to have said that often it might not be possible to achieve all that was required. Since the VLW was the common agent of all Extension Officers at the Block Headquarters, he could not

concentrate on the targets given by one Extension Officer. The result was that he had to suspend some activities at a certain time in order to achieve one particular target. This reads a little laconically. It is difficult indeed to imagine how one not-very-well educated or trained worker could possibly handle a fraction of the tasks required.

It may well be that only a combination of showing visiting senior staff only the best, reporting fictitious achievements, and conniving pretense between VLWs and their supervisors, allowed such an unworkable system to persist. The error here, as generally with multiple programmes or multiple masters, was a failure to identify the time and energy of field staff as an inelastic scarce and valuable resource, the optimal use of which requires careful planning and programming.

(iv) Authoritarianism Without Supervision. Another pathalogical condition, especially where hierarchy is very marked, is an authoritarian management style combined with a lack of effective supervision. This can take the form of hectoring and abuse of junior staff in meetings, of a refusal to listen to their problems and of rigid target-setting. For his part, the senior officer feels insecure and defends and reassures himself through asserting his authority. He is reluctant to supervise in detail lest he encounter discordant information. For their part subordinate staff respond with deference and only report information which they think will be well received.

When supervision is given, authoritarianism and the need to assert authority can make it less an aid to morale, commitment and competence, and more a dispiriting inquisition. In Ghana, for instance, as recently as 1976, a group of rural primary school teachers denounced their superintendents as "professional fault finders".

The natural outcome is low motivation to perform well on the part of the junior staff and a conspiracy of misinformation which impedes reform. Worse, it slows progress towards more effective training and learning for rural people.

(v) Conditions of Service. Many problems faced by field staff can be described as conditions of service. In a physical sense, these may include discomforts and inconveniences experienced living in rural areas.

the management side, the problems include terms of service, prospects of promotion, opportunities for advancement through training, recognition and rewards for good work, and irregular receipt of pay. The most common complaints are that promotion comes faster to those in headquarters, than to those in the field and that it is based on influence and affiliation rather than performance and merit; that transfers are unpredictable and come either too often or not often enough; that pay and allowances are inadequate and sometimes delayed; and that resources needed for work are either not provided or are provided in inadequate quantity and quality or late. The list could be lengthened, and the problems are neither universal nor by any means limited to field bureaucracies in third world countries. They do, however, quite often reach pathological levels, and solving them is sometimes a necessary though not sufficient condition for improving performance.

Urban and Elite Biases

Given the dispiriting conditions of management and service just catalogued, it is not surprising that the phenomenon termed 'urban bias' exerts a powerful attraction on the educator-trainers posted to rural communities.

to be better serviced than life in the villages and homesteads. Better housing is more readily available, piped water is more likely to be supplied, electricity is probably provided, roads and public transport are superior, the necessities and minor luxuries of living are more accessible, entertainments of various kinds are more lavishly offered. Towns also tend to be the seats of government, power and influence. Those with influence tend to ensure that they have good amenities. Accordingly, the towns are better served with hospitals,

clinics and schools. In addition, because such institutions are only as good as the personnel who run them, those with influence . arrange for the better operators - doctors, nurses, teachers-to be stationed in their local institutions. They . also arrange that such institutions are better equipped than average.

One example will suffice to illustrate the point. A small town of 5,000 people in Central Java had five villages lying within three miles of it. Six primary schools served this set of communities. The five village communities had to build and maintain their own schools, but the town school was built by contractors and was of superior construction. The benches in the village schools were adequate, but the town school had been given a special grant by the government administrator to buy good desks. The headmasters of the village schools were good men, but the town school's headmaster was outstanding for his teaching, his ideas, energy and examination results (he personally taught the exam class). The government administrator had had him imported from another district. The not surprising reason for all this was that the government administrator's own three children attended the town school, along with the children of the local civil servants, police and military.

The efforts of the influential to secure good people and good facilities for the institutions which serve them and their families are by no means unwelcome to the 'good' people themselves. For, naturally, they too appreciate what the towns can offer them and <u>their</u> families. Such a complementarity

of interest between the influential and the 'good' tends to prolong, if not perpetuate and increase, the under-development of the rural areas. It can be counteracted only by deliberate and sustained policy and action in which persuasion and moral coercion are mixed with material and moral incentives.

The primacy of the towns and of the urban way of life creates another, possibly minor, problem for education-and- training programmes for rural people. The head-quarters and regional offices of the people services tend to be in towns. Accordingly, they tend to follow the working rhythms of towns, with fixed, regular hours, little varied by the vagaries of climate and season. The pattern is reproduced in the district and local offices. The office staff then set the trend for the rural field-workers. The latter tend to follow the urban pattern and to be disinclined to fit themselves to the rather more irregular and unpredictable demands of working with rural folk. Even where they do concede to rural exigencies, they do so with some consciousness that they are making concessions and sacrifices, that they are going beyond their strict obligations. In spirit, many of the rural field workers are urban office workers: their inclination is to have their work ordered round proper working hours, rather than change their hours to suit the work at hand.

If the towns attract the more able educator-trainers away from the rural areas, within the villages themselves a similar complementarity of interest attracts the more able towards the more energetic, better off and more influential groups and away from the poorer and needier. (It requires to be said in parenthesis that in some societies the more able and energetic do not necessarily overlap with the more influential or with the better off. Traditional rulers and functionaries may be neither able nor rich, yet retain considerable sway within particular communities.) The reason is not difficult to divine. An English proverb notes that birds of a feather flock together. The educator-trainers of the people-services belong simultaneously to two privileged groups in their society. They are among the minority who have had both long schooling and job training: they belong to the educated, even if they are in the lower levels of that particular group. They are also among the minority who have regular salaried jobs which bring them an income well above the national average per capita.

Further, it is often the case that those who do achieve long schooling and subsequent training are themselves from families who are more than averagely fortunate in wealth and income. A study in India, for instance, showed that the graduates of an agricultural faculty, who would probably take up posts as agricultural extension officers, came from the top ten per cent of land-owning families.

These three factors, then, will dispose the personnel of the people-services to give their attention to people with whom communication can be more easily established, who 'talk the same language', who share the same interests. The same factors will discincline the personnel from dealing with people who are less schooled, poorer, less ready to acknowledge the usefulness of the people-services and perhaps less able to take advantage of them.

Field staff may be genuinely unaware of the poorer people in the areas where they work. The poorer people may tend to live together in places which may be neither seen nor visited. In Western Kenya, Ssennyonga (1976) has pointed out the emergence of what he calls a "rural roadside elite ecology", as those who are better off buy up plots beside the road and benefit from the tarmac road, the water supply, the electricity, and the telephone, the poorer people retreat into the unseen areas away from the road. In South India, many of the poorest rural people are harijans who live in separate villages or separate parts of villages which some field staff may find it easier and more congenial not to visit. The invisibility of some of the poorest people to local-level staff can be illustrated from Western Kenya. When agricultural extension workers carried out a survey of a random sample of farmers in the areas where they worked, they complained that the sample contained far too few progressive farmers to be representative; and they were surprised by the many poor people they found themselves visiting. One Home Economics Assistant said that she burst into tears at the poverty and misery of some of the people in her sample, people whom she said she would never have met in the normal course of her work.

There may also be a straightforward unwillingness to work with the poorer groups. A community development worker in Zambia who exceptionally had completed his secondary schooling

argued that his talents were wasted among the villagers and that he would be better employed at the provincial headquarters. Such an attitude is reflected in a survey of villagers' opinions carried out in Zambia in 1967. The villagers divided people into two groups, villagers and town-dwellers. When pressed further about community development and agricultural extension workers, they opined that these were townspeople who were temporarily living in the village.

What clearer signal could there be that the workers of the people-services are not always oriented towards the people they are intended to serve?

All the preceding remarks are about the 'teaching' side. There are two further areas which make up the anatomy of education-and-training in rural areas: these are the learners and the relation between the learners and the 'teachers'.

Goals for Learners.

Before anybody sets himself or herself to learn anything deliberately, he has to be convinced by one means or another that that thing is worth learning. Primary school children learn their alphabets and numbers - and often travel considerable distances to do so - because their parents and teachers have convinced them that that is a good thing to do. Village women join knitting and embroidery groups often because they see some prospect of higher incomes through new skills. Village women will also join groups on baby-care and nutrition, not for higher incomes, but because they feel it will be good for their families.

The will or the willingness to learn, in other words, arises from an acknowledged need to learn or from the prospect of some reward for learning.

In both cases, there is a goal for learning. That is to say: any programme of education-and-training must be careful that the goals it puts before its prospective learners are worthwhile in their terms. It is also to imply that the more worthwhile the goal in the learners' terms, the more likely successful learning will occur.

In the case of education-and-training programmes for rural populations, a key feature about learners and goals is their diversity. This diversity cuts across many dimensions. Although in some ways it can be superficial, yet it affects the learners themselves strongly and therefore needs to be taken into account in the design of any programmes. The basis for this caution will become clearer as we proceed.

At its simplest, a single learner will have many roles in life. If a man, he may be a husband, father, farmer, counsellor to neighbours, members of a local organisation, possibly an honorary official of it, or a functionary in some community responsibility. A woman may similarly combine the roles of wife, mother, daughter (of aged parents), contributory (or even main) breadwinner, farmer, housewife and family cook and functionary in some community responsibility. These roles will vary in salience in the learner's mind and will probably be given, even if unconsciously, different priorities in the learner's scheme of things. In some of the roles, the learner will feel comfortable and secure and be conscious of no need whatsoever to learn anything to achieve greater competence in them. If a people-service were interested in enhancing one or other of these roles, it would have to make

a deliberate effort either to identify and make a relevant need clear or to point out the possibilities of worthwhile and hitherto unnoticed rewards in changes in the ways these roles were currently fulfilled. In other roles, the learner may well feel the need for change and be ready to respond to an opportunity for learning how to change. Differences of salience, priority and satisfaction will create diversity of need and response in groups and communities whose roles and circumstances appear to be very similar.

Diversity of Learners.

Perhaps most crucial for the people-services is the diversity in awareness of the need for change and in the desire for improvement in the spheres in which people-services usually operate. Nearly twenty years ago Kusum Nair found that the poorest of the villages she met seemed to be the least ambitious, the least willing to contemplate much change (Nair 1960). Writers on what is sometimes called 'The Culture of Poverty' have commented also on the apparent conservatism, even apathy of very poor people. Similarly, René Dumont, an agronomist, has noted the " caution " of peasant communities to contemplate learning new methods of production and marketing, (Dumont, 1966), while a Director of Agricultural Extension in one of the middling rich provinces of Turkey could complain even in 1972 that the village farmers were not interested in learning anything, and certainly not in using the services of his department. Simultaneous with this sort of comment come others rather different. It is seen, for instance, that the larger, wealthier and better educated farmers have learned to make much more effective uses of the 'Green Revolution', than their less well-off neighbours Lionberger and his

perhaps better known successor, Rogers, have pointed to the differing propensities to learn about and to adopt innovations among people of similar communities within a number of countries round the world, (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1973). Often, in agriculture especially, those who innovate are those who have the resources neededt o make the innovation profitable. It is no surprise that the people-services respond most to those people who respond best to their messages; and pay least attention to those who are either less able or willing to respond, or who are excluded by the more responsive.

Besides the diversity between individuals in responsiveness, there is also diversity between communities. Most obviously, features of the physical environment vary, so that the messages of the people-services need to vary also and so too does the expertise of their personnel. A clear case is the radio-discussion campaign in Tanzania, 'Man is Health', where the package of practices for health and the prevention of diseases was suitable for most of the mainland, but not for a large area of the north-west, (Hall 1974).

Questions of culture arise, also. One man's meat may be another's poison and what may interest one community, may be an insult to another. People in one part of a country may insist that they are not like their fellow-citizens elsewhere, so that messages for education-and-training need to be handled differently for different learning groups.

ACCION Popular in Colombia has, with its

travelling production workshop, tuned its responses to cultural diversity very finely. Where several people-services decide to work together on an education-and-training programme spanning the nation or even a number of communities in different areas, they will need to assess whether a single programme will suffice, or whether they will need to assemble a number of slightly differing approaches.

Even within communities and groups who take advantage of opportunities to join education-and-training programmes, there is diversity. In the first place, it affects capacities to learn. The phenomenon is of course commonplace in schools. It holds also among adult groups. Literacy programmes, for instance, have found an exceedingly wide range of ability to master the skills of reading. Even wider are the ranges for arithmetic and writing. There are differences also in application and persistence. Women's groups learning handicrafts may show higher rates of attendance and continuation than those learning simple literacy or baby-care; nevertheless, no group will have a perfect record. Differences show up in the way people participate in discussions, in their energy, in their capacity to retain information and skill, in their tendencies to dilute new practices, and in their needs for encouragement and support.

Where a number of people-services decide to cooperate on an education-and-training programme, they will need to give thought to handling these diverse capacities and needs. Two further points can be made. First, in areas where long-term migration is a strong feature of social life, the people-services may find themselves dealing with a particularly difficult population.

The more able, the more energetic, those with schooling may have departed in large proportions. Those males remaining will tend to be the relatively old, the very young, the more apathetic, possibly the less energetic and less ambitious. The women will probably be less affected by the drain, but may well be all the more burdened by having not only their own usual roles to fulfil, but those of their absent menfolk as well.

Second, differences in schooling will tend to accentuate differences in learning capacities and styles. The more schooled may tend to be readier to accept discussion rather than lecture as a means of learning: Jon Unger, interviewing emigrants from the Kwangtung Province of China, found the unschooled peasants much less able to evaluate their experiences than young people who had been through school.

All these differences will pose for the people-services the question of how best to balance their education-and-training between aiming at individuals as individuals and aiming at individuals as members of groups with interests, views and habits in common.

Community Support.

Factors which have little to do with capacity or willingness to learn may also affect the learners. In communities where the local leadership is well accepted, strong and positively inclined toward government services, education-and-training programmes may have little difficulty in being effective. By contrast, where the local leadership regards such programmes at best as unnecessary or at worst positively harmful to the way things are, entry and operation may be impossible or

abortive. Where the community is divided by feud and faction, organising a programme for one group may entail either hostility boycott and sabotage from another or a demand that the facilities be duplicated. Between these two poles will be found a range of situations in which the local leadership will be more or less supportive in identifying suitable goal, possible aids, possible obstacles, and in encouraging learners to participate.

More simply, where people live in small and scattered hamlets rather than in larger settlements. where seasonal migration for work or other purposes is high, or where the population is nomadic, any people-services will have to consider how these particular circumstances will affect potential learners and, reciprocally, how they will affect its own ability to respond to any needs for education-and-training. These questions will probably be more difficult to resolve, where several people-services contemplate cooperating.

Even when the programme and administration have been settled, there arise external distractions and disincentives for learners. While the direct financial costs of taking part in any programme may be nil or negligible for any given learner, the costs in terms of opportunities forgone, (not simply in income, but in other jobs done, family obligations skimped, social satisfactions missed), of inconvenience and disruption, of the distance and conditions of travel may be sufficient to dissipate motivation and thereafter participation. The diversity of these distractions is again something which must influence planning and programming.

Within the education-and-training itself, factors of

discouragement operate fairly powerfully. It seems to be a wide experience that adult learners are often easily disillusioned and discouraged. If progress and results are not immediately detected, motivation seems to recede rapidly. The same thing happens, if first results are disappointing. Some years ago in eastern Zambia, the agricultural extension department put a lot of effort into encouraging and instructing farmers in the production of Turkish tobacco. Because of the high degree of support and supervision throughout the process from sowing to curing, the crop was good and the prices spectacularly high. The following season, the demands for help and advice expanded enormously, well beyond the department's capacity to handle with the same degree of attention. The crop was good, but the harvesting and curing faulty. So most growers were disappointed with the prices they got. In the third season, the demands for help were much reduced. Rephrased in general terms, the case suggests that, even where the goals and rewards of an education-and-tra ning programme attract learners powerfully, learning needs to be immediately and strongly successful to avoid substantial discouragement and desertion.

Identifying Needs and Goals.

A propos goals and rewards and their diversity in rural populations, it needs to be said on the negative side that most rural education-and-training programmes cannot offer goals which are very powerful. If they could, rural development might have made rather more rapid headway than it has, despite the obstacles set by a number of social, economic and political relationships and institutions. On the whole, education-and-training programmes offer small, incremental and often remote improvements to life and income. On the more positive side, the very diversity of goals to which a given individual or group

may respond in virtue of the many roles to be filled, offers a possibility of combining a number of goals to make an attractive programme.

Even the matter of getting villages to determine their own needs and goals and to formulate them in terms which permit programmes of education, training and action is not simple or easy.

Even more difficult, of course, has been the business of trying to get rural people to view some circumstances as problems to be solved, not merely as features to be accepted and borne. The patient team of the Enseignement Moyen Practique in Senegal, (Le Brun 1976) needed 9 months of dialogue and consultation, before the villagers with whom they worked agreed that the problem of irrelevant schooling and unemployment among their educated children might be broached by themselves. On the other hand, the work of Srinivasan and Crone (Srinivasan 1976) in the Philippines with groups of rural women from villages which had become known as 'difficult' has suggested that such experience may be due, at least in part, to inappropriate approaches.

Interactions.

The third area in the problem is the relationships and interactions between the people-services and the people who are supposed to be learning for rural development.

The first point of concern is how the two parties view each other. Earlier it was suggested that possibly too many

of the personnel in the people-services had too little sympathy with rural populations, and especially with the poorer sections of them. In some cases and some countries it would not be too strong to state that some field-workers actually despise the people for whom they are ostensibly working. A case from Zambia has already been cited. Mathur (1972) studied some Indian Block Development Officers, some of whom had actually been born and raised in villages: he was dismayed to find a large proportion of them contemptuous of the villagers' backwardness, ignorance, stubborn conservatism and so on. Brooke (1978), as recently as 1976, concluded that the few teachers he had interviewed in rural Mexico had no sympathy and little communication with the parents of their pupils - a conclusion that was not varied even where he found teachers teaching in the village of their birth. If such attitudes are prevalent and persist into the late 1970's, it is not surprising that authoritarian attitudes towards the peasantry persist also. For, clearly, people who cannot be respected and who are regarded as having little intelligence or culture of their own, cannot be trusted to manage their own development, let alone actually advise the experts on what might be done. They need to be told. One manner of telling was current in Indonesia not long ago, and in a slightly different form, in Turkey also. A district administrator would gather technical personnel in a party and make a progress through a number of villages. At each, the villagers would be assembled to listen to a series of lectures from their visitors on various topics of life and development. Questions and discussion were minimal. After two to three hours of this, the visitors would be offered hospitality, and then depart. It is no wonder that a course of

field workers from four Asian countries should, in 1976, confess that in their countries some villagers said that "...the officers came as masters to push and order them around ..... They came in their awe-inspiring uniforms and were always afraid of dirtying them in the dirt and dust of village problems ..... Each visit of a government official could mean a loss of at least two chickens, which had to be cooked to 'entertain' the officials and earn the village a 'good' name". (Bhasin, 1977). These perceptions are different only in degree from the responses cited earlier from villagers in Zambia. Nobody would assert that all the workers in all the people-services in all countries despised rural folk, or that all villagers were apathetic or hostile to all people-services everywhere, - there is too much experience to the contrary. Nevertheless, the persistence of such remarks suggests that all is not well in the relationships between those whose task is to help people to learn and the learners themselves.

Separate from contempt, hostility and suspicion, but still complicating matters, are mutual disappointment and loss of confidence. Most extension workers with a few years of experience can quote anecdotes of how they have been let down by community leaders and other participants in education-and-training programmes. René Dumont, in an informal lecture once told of a minor disaster in Zambia. At a cooperative farm growing cotton, the agricultural technician noted that the crop was beginning to be infested by some insect. He told the members and recommended that remedial action be taken at once. However, the meeting had other concerns and voted to defer the treatment. When the decision was finally taken to adopt the technician's advice,

a large proportion of the crop had been damaged and lost. Dumont's conclusion was 'Democracy comes after development!' It is the sort of conclusion with which many field workers would heartily agree. It also illustrates why 'participation' through democratic processes of discussion and consensuses has often foundered.

There is the other side, too, of course. Many villagers could tell of literacy classes which were formed and then left without learning materials; of training in new seeds and other agricultural inputs, which was not followed by the delivery of the inputs; of projects begun but never brought to fruition; of expectations raised, then disappointed; of spirited promises followed by silence and neglect; sometimes of plain deceit and oppression.

However, disappointment does not last forever. Field-workers and their superiors are transferred, the generations in the villages succeed each other. Newcomers on one side may be more sympathetic, more effective, while, on the other side, apathy or intransigence may be followed by energy and revived hope for betterment through using the people-services. In the changed situation, the difficulties of 'social distance' or mutual antipathy may be overcome. Even so, problems of communication remain and, with them, possibilities of new misunderstandings.

In the first and most elementary place, the cast of mind of somebody who has been schooled and systematically trained over many years is different from that of somebody who has never experienced structured cognitive training. In effect, they "speak a different language", somehow they must establish a common footing. (Earlier we noted how field workers tend

to attract and be attracted by those who 'speak the same language'). Second, the differences of view between those who see situations as specialists and those who experience those situations as laymen, can be considerable. So, too, are judgements on what really are problems and on what the priorities are between them. The dice then are loaded against there being an easy common perception of goals and priorities, and thence of needs for education-and-training.

Third, the specialist by her or his training, is drawn actually to advocate, perhaps to press for, the situation to be seen mainly in terms of his own professional concern, and, further, in terms of his own professional opinion. The pressure in this direction is compounded by elements we have noted earlier: the requirements for initiative and progress, the ability to act independently, at least in part, the quicker, if partial, perceptions of what the problems and opportunities are, the control of resources needed by the learner. The bias here is towards attempting to replace the learners' goals and priorities, however mistily formulated, by those of the people-services. The risk of imperfect understanding of the goals and of misguided motivation on the part of the learners is always present. By contrast, for reasons already touched, the polar ideal of 'participation' as a process whereby a community reviews its needs, recognises problems, reckons its resources, orders its priorities, draws up its plans, mobilises the necessary resources from government and from itself and finally goes into action - this is seldom achieved. The major tendency remains for the external change-agents to envisage and to press for specified changes, not simply to discuss them. It flows chiefly from the unequal nature of the relationships between the agents of the people-services and their prospective learners.

CHALLENGES TO INNOVATE

Two steps may be helpful before we embark on the search for options for improving education-and-training for rural populations. First, we shall summarise the analysis of the previous chapter and, second, we shall examine the terms 'coordination', 'integration' and 'participation' a little more closely.

1. The biases of most societies militate against working with rural populations: to the contrary, they tend to drain rural areas of their most able people.

2. The biases of most government budgets militate against proper support for rural education-and-training programmes: to the contrary, they underpin poor management and poor performance.

3. The biases of most government people-services militate against working closely with rural learners: to the contrary, they tend to drain their most able personnel away from the rural learners.

4. The biases of most government people-services militate against working in close cooperation with each other: to the contrary, the specialist bases and their prime mandates to show results tend to encourage isolation and compartmentalisation.

5. The biases of most government people-services militate against full participation and even catalysed-participation by both their own lower echelons and the rural learners. To the contrary, they encourage subordinating participation among their lower echelons and persuaded - or even worse, pseudo-participation by the rural learners.

6. Because the more able personnel of the people-services are biased towards working through (and not responding to) their less able and less expert subordinates; and because of the scarcity of resources, too much is expected from the less able and less expert in return for too little supervision and support.

7. The diversity of needs, roles and interests among rural learners reinforces the bias against coordination, among the people-services. Indeed, it encourages fragmentation.

8. The scarcity of personnel and other resources among the people-personnel as against to the potential number of rural learners militates against those most in need of education-and-training and in favour of those best placed to respond to the people-services.

The Meanings of Coordination and Integration

Those are the major points of our diagnosis. Turning now to 'coordination' and 'integration', we can start by noting that whatever meaning they are given for a particular discussion, they are frequently used as though they yield benefits at no cost whatever. The fact is, whatever the form in which they are attempted, both coordination and integration can entail high, if often hidden, costs.

The first cost is the sacrifice or evasion of hard thinking. Both words have such intimations of good, that they can be used to cover up a failure to come to grips with a problem. They slip smoothly off the tongues of practised non-thinkers, enabling them with little effort to generate prose which is so meaningless that not even the most aggressive critic can find anything to get his teeth into. They pad out publications, as in this example from a document entitled Integrated Approach to Rural Development in Africa :

> "...the concept of the "integrated" approach in the context of rural development means "integral" approach in the sense that it is a highly structural and systematic exercise in which all components in the system of development can be understood as important and appreciated for the part which they play individually and collectively. In this sense, the concept differs from the "harmonization" of plans and the "co-operation" of various agencies. It also has significance for the co-ordination of rural development plans"

But it is not just that these words enable people to say little or nothing. More damagingly, by obfuscation they also reduce the chances of action. There may well be a law that the chances that a report will be implemented vary inversely with the frequency with which the words "coordination" and "integration" are

used. For action requires specification of detail: of who will do what, when, how, with whom, and with what resources.

The second cost is time. Time not spent on coordination can be time misspent on abortive action. But equally time spent on coordination can be time lost for useful action. For instance, coordinating the various parties for an education-and-training programme on the social impact of high-yielding varieties of seed took so long, that the programme missed the planting season and had to be postponed for a full year. The literature of rural development is liberally decorated with appeals for maximum coordination and integration between all departments at all levels. A little thought shows that coordination means communication: it means meetings, minutes of meetings, reports, ad hoc consultations, joint activities. All of these take time. Maximum coordination might well mean that all the time of all those concerned at each of several levels would be taken up in communication. Nothing, apart from communication, would be achieved and the result would be paralysis.

Third, even coordination and integration which are less than maximal can be stultifying, blunting imagination and initiatives, restraining action to some lowest common denominator of mediocrity, or quite simply stopping anything happening. The more people and the more departments involved in making the decision, the greater are the chances that it will emerge in a conventional form, and the greater the dangers that nothing will be done, either because there are so many comments and conflicting views that they cannot be resolved, or because one of the participants exercises a veto. Coordination by military command is one thing. Coordination between equals requires negotiation, which requires compromise, which often entails loss of momentum and cutting edge.

Fourth, coordination and integration may be used to describe what are really issues of power. Those who call for coordination (with themselves or their departments as coordinators) are often really saying that they (or their departments) should have authority and control. The outcome of attempts to coordinate

may be exacerbated by departmental rivalries which divert energy and time from substantive developmental activities. In the words of Andrew Young

> "Bureaucratic coordination can be the death of development. We can get so concerned about protecting our bureaucratic vested interests that we never get to the people with the resources they so desperately need."
>
> (reported in The Observer (London) 20.11.77)

A fifth cost of integration and coordination in the context of rural development is usually explicitly acknowledged and accepted, but can be severely underestimated. It is that focusing the efforts of a number of people-services on a restricted population through special schemes entails privilege for one group of people and deprivation for another. The early Peasant and Master Farmer Schemes, the Intensive Agricultural Development Programme Districts of India, their equivalents in Zambia, the Village Settlement Programme in Tanzania in the mid-1960s, the settlement schemes in Nigeria and the 'Selective Intensive' approach of UNESCO's Experimental World Literacy Programme are all examples where relatively small groups of people had relatively large proportions of personnel and resources from a number of services devoted to assisting their development. Conversely, because of the scarcity of resources, (artificial or otherwise), other groups of people could have nothing offered to them at all. The justification for such a strategy is clear enough: in circumstances of scarcity, choices have to be made and the better choice may be coordinated and integrated heavy investment in a few people or a restricted area of high potential where returns will be high leading later to a gradual spread to other people and areas, rather than light and fragmented investment over much larger populations in a much shorter time.

The drawback to the strategy is that, once a population has secured a flow of resources for itself, it becomes unwilling to surrender its advantage. What was meant as a temporary, privileged pump-priming is gradually transformed into a 'right in perpetuity'. Further, there may be a tendency for the investments to grow heavier, rather than to tail off. (See for instance Holtham and Hazlewood, 1976, on the people-services available to beneficiaries from the 'White Highlands' in Kenya).

In short, the benefits of coordination and integration

may be offset by the costs of increasing inequities and of inequalities growing beyond the limits first planned.

On the other hand, coordination and integration cannot be totally dismissed as irrelevant and unhelpful mystification. It is desirable that, after farmers have been trained in the use of a pesticide, that particular pesticide be easily available at prices they can afford: coordination between the training agency and its supplier counterpart is required. Again, it is desirable that, if a functional literacy class is learning about the spacing of children, its members should be able to call on the assistance of a medical specialist for more advice. If farmers and their wives are learning to grow a new food crop, it obviously makes sense that the agricultural training be complemented by training to add the crop to the family's diet. To put it in general terms, coordination which ensures that education-and-training can be immediately applied, i.e. through the correct synchronisation of sequences, is necessary to the effectiveness of the training. So is coordination which helps the effects of one learning programme to be spread to another, i.e. through capitalising on potential complementarity.

The challenge then is to judge the balance where coordination most helps effectiveness.

Toolittle may lead to chaos. Too much may end in inaction. What needs to be kept in mind is simply this. The goal of a programme of education-and-training is the development of the learner. This, to give it a jargon, is what is to be maximised. Coordination and integration are not goals. They are merely means. Accordingly, they are not to be maximised. They are to be optimised or used only to the point where they assist development to be maximised. It is possible to have costs without benefits: there may be no benefits in coordinating a campaign to introduce hybrid maize, say, with a campaign to enable mothers to monitor their babies' weight gains. Even when there is a case for liaison between departments, it may not be worth the costs of the meetings, the waiting, the discussion, and even sometimes the demoralisation involved. There will always be intelligent university researchers and official evaluators who will identify situations where two campaign teams arrived at the same place on

the same day to work with the same people, or where one department did not know the relevant plans of another; and who will with wise hindsight point to a "lack of coordination". They may not appreciate that for an optimal balance of costs and benefits occasional clashes of this sort have to be accepted.

The argument, then, is not that some coordination of activities as with some joint programming, interdepartmental liaison and resource sharing, is undesirable. It is, rather, that these should be specified for what they are, and appraised separately for their costs and benefits. They should not be hidden away out of sight in the coordination-integration portmanteau. Then it will be easier to gauge whether the benefits justify the costs.

The Meaning of Participation

As with 'coordination' and 'integration', 'participation' is a fashionable word, which is used loosely. It sounds like an intrinsic and unquestionable good and like a costless benefit. 'Participation' is often regarded as a means towards enabling people to take control of their own development. (In this sense we would term it full-participation.) Working towards it may mean delaying the achievement of some other goal like increased food production for improved rural nutrition. Conversely, an urgent need for food production may incur subordinating-participation and delay progress to full participation. So in practice, it is useful to analyse what form of 'participation' is acceptably compatible with the attainment of some other aspect of development. It is useful thereafter to examine what such participation might involve: who does what, with whom, and with what costs and benefits. Participation in a self-help project may mean that the poorer rural people are expected to contribute proportionately more in terms of their incomes than those who are better off. Participation in the construction of a communal facility may in practice involve mainly women working while the men, who may be equal beneficiaries, do little. Participation in the cultivation of a communal plot may have high private costs (whatever the communal benefits) in terms of alternatives forgone. Participation in almost any non-agricultural activity at times of labour peaks in many rural societies can have very high costs indeed to families.

The situations mentioned in the preceding paragraph concern very local and specific projects, where full-participation by all concerned is a physical possibility. There are others, of course, where some form of representative-participation would offer the only practicable mode for decision. Arranging cooperation between two or three communities, for instance, or negotiating with or making representations to the district or provincial government could not easily be managed through full-participation.

As with coordination and integration, then, a balance has to be negotiated. The mode of participation will have to be selected through weighing the desirability and costs of allowing everybody a direct say in decisions which affect him or her, against the desirability and costs of conducting business with despatch.

Challenges to Innovate.

Taking into account the diagnosis of existing people-services together with the cautions about popular slogans, we will now outline six approaches for those who want more effectively to organise education-and-training programmes for rural populations. These are:

1. The use of management procedures within existing organisations
2. The creation of a unified command
3. The one-off national campaign
4. Learning from and with rural people
5. The School and other education
6. Generals to the Front!

1. Management Procedures.

In suggesting that management procedures present options there are dangers.

The first danger is the uncritical transfer of techniques from one administrative culture to another. Many of the management techniques in vogue from time to time have been evolved for use in business and government organisations in the United States. As with other technology, they bear the imprint of the culture in which they have been developed;. elsewhere the conditions for a successful transfer and transplant may not exist. As Moris has pointed out:

> "While we have little difficulty enumerating for export various promising managerial techniques (PERT, Management by Objectives, etc.) we know almost nothing about the structural prerequisites that underlie their effectiveness in the parent society. Nevertheless, it does appear that the transfer of

> at least some parts of this surrounding administrative culture is an essential precondition for the effective transfer of these techniques into other administrative systems."
> (1977:77)

Second, the techniques may be "sold" to third world countries when in their countries of origin they are already being questioned, abandoned, or at least treated with more circumspection than when they were first devised. Many management techniques that seemed promising a decade ago have fallen into disuse. The current attitutde towards techniques as such among British managers has been said to be one of "very nearly total" disillusionment and barely a dozen survive in proven, widespread use (Argenti 1976 quoted in Moris 1977:75). Even in the case of the use of PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) in the construction of the Polaris submarine, it has been argued that the method was more effective as a public relations exercise to protect and support the programme than as a technique for its internal management. (Sapolsky 1972) Some of the analytical and prescriptive writings about techniques for rural management in third world countries (for example Kulp 1970; Kulp 1977) whatever their analytical merits are open to the criticism of hyper-complexity when it comes to application. The introduction of excessive management techniques in the Canadian civil service is said to have led to a "saturation psychosis" and to bureaucrats saying that either they could use the techniques, or do their job, but not both (Laframboise 1971). A fortiori, such techniques may be dysfunctional in administrations which labour under the problems outlined.

The third danger is the introduction of techniques in isolation without considering their relationship to the rest of the existing system. Management techniques may appear an easy way out. But as Benor and Harrison (1977) emphasise in their description of experience with the training and visit system for agricultural extension, change may not be easy to introduce since a condition for its success may be the elimination of other tasks and responsibilities. An additive approach, in which a new procedure is added to existing procedures, may merely exacerbate the work overload. A more extensive and deeper reform will often be needed.

To generalise for different types of education and training programme in different countries and different continents is, to say

the least, rash. What we can offer here is not any universal prescriptions, but rather a menu à la carte of principles and methods which seem worth considering and some of which have been proven quite widely. Readers however, will have to judge for themselves whether, to what extent, and in what ways they might be applied to particular situations.

We suggest that three principles apply generally:

treating administrative capacity as a scarce resource

Administrative capacity is the capability for getting things done; in our context this means especially the organisation of training and education programmes. It is influenced in practice by the numbers of staff, their training ability and motivation and is associated with the hours that they work, the quality of their work, and the volume of their work output. Administrative capacity is frequently treated as though it were an infinitely elastic resource. Programmes and requirements flow out chasing and burying earlier programmes and requirements without thought for the time and energy available for their execution. To be sure, administrative capacity is to some extent elastic; but beyond a certain point overload may lead to reduced work output. This applies especially at the lower levels of field administration. Only when administrative capacity is treated as a scarce and rather inelastic resource is it possible to see that demands upon it must be planned and rationed.

optimising, not maximising

As we have seen in the discussion of coordination and integration, we are often concerned with trying not to maximise but to optimise. This is because field administrative situations usually involve the use of multiple resources with multiple objectives. To try to maximise the contribution towards any one objective may not be, indeed usually will not be, an optimal outcome because of the nature of the trade-offs with other objectives. This is often the case with field staff in training and education programmes. It is rare indeed to find only one objective. Usually one is concerned with achieving an optimal mix of several objectives.

sophistication in simplicity

In the design and introduction of management techniques in field administration, there is a cardinal paradox. The drives of per-

fectionism impel those responsible into ever greater complexity. There is always more information to be demanded, additional activities to be performed, more problems to be anticipated. The normal response of fairly intelligent people is to try to cope with these issues by adding procedures and requirements to the programme. Reporting is made more extensive, monitoring more precise, evaluation more penetrating. But such measures may conflict with the first two principles by overloading scarce administrative capacity and failing to optimise outcomes. The solution lies in a reversal of values. Sophisticated is often supposed to be complex. But complex can be crude and clumsy. True sophistication is to be found in knowing what it is not optimal to do - what it is not necessary to know, what actions can be left out, who need not be consulted, and the like; in short, in being simple.

Applying these three principles to rural management, and bearing in mind the pathological conditions of top-down targetry, excessive reporting, multiple programmes and masters, authoritarianism, and lack of supervision which were analysed earlier, measures for reform can be suggested. It will be noted that these are supported by some of the evidence in the case studies. Four clusters of measures are suggested:

pruning

A start is often best made in an analysis of workloads. This should include workloads at different levels in the organisation since it may be found as Leonard (1977) did with agricultural administration in Kenya, that the heaviest overload is not at the bottom of the hierarchy with field staff but a little higher up. It may be found that it is impossible for staff to do all that is theoretically required of them. The situation may be exacerbated by unrealistic top-down target-setting. A solution may be found in radical pruning: in eliminating most or all of the top-down targetting; in reducing reports and returns, making them few, lean, and functional; in limiting meetings, making them short; and in abandoning some programmes, leaving only those of highest priority. Pruning is painful, and even alarming; but vital to ensure vigour.

programming

Systematic work planning is such an obvious measure that it is odd how rarely it is effectively carried out. Partly it is that when sudden unplanned demands on time are common, programming makes less sense than when a staff member has, within his programme, a fair degree of autonomy. Various systems of work programming are possible. Among the more effective are those which involve client groups (as is commonly the case with training and education programmes) since arrangements made beforehand with them exercise a certain discipline on the trainer or educator. Similarly, programming in which the junior staff member and his supervisor jointly take part has the advantage that both know what has been decided and both are committed to it through taking part in the programming exercise (Chambers 1974: 43).

participation

Authoritarian management contrasts with participatory forms. There are cultural factors operating here and the optimal mix of authority and participation in staff relations between levels in a bureaucratic hierarchy will differ between continents, countries and regions. The optimal mix also depends on the tasks being performed. Participatory management may be more needed in bureaucracies undertaking training and education than in others concerned with more routinised or disciplinary activities - a law-and-order administration, a police force, an organisation for the protection of forests, or wild game, for example. Successful education and training requires a sensitivity to clients, a capacity to listen, a readiness even on the part of the teacher to learn, which are less nurtured in authoritarian than in participatory bureaucracies. A teacher or trainer who is bullied and bossed about by his superior is more likely to bully and boss those whom he is teaching or training, than one who is consulted, treated as a responsible worker, and given some discretion in planning the details of his work.

supervision

At the same time, supervision is a key factor in success. Supervision of scattered field staff is difficult. The combination of low supervision and top-down target-setting leads to a world of make-believe in which mythical achievements are reported. One

solution, peroposed by Leonard for agricultural extension in Kenya, and perhaps widely applicable, is to concentrate programmes on work which is of its nature easy to supervise. Leonard observes that extension methods involving groups and demonstrations

> "represent an inspectable, relatively infrequent, final product of a considerable amount of extension work and the observation of them is likely to tell the supervisor almost everything he would like to know about his junior's performance. All kinds of things can be ascertained from one hour at the demonstration or lecture of a subordinate."
>
> (1977:205)

Moreover, teaching and training have the advantage of having to be pre-programmed so that a supervisor should be able to know where, when and with whom his subordinates will be working. He can then programme his own supervisory visits. (For an example, see Benor and Harrison 1977).

Perhaps we had better add a word on what we would regard as helpful supervision. The objective of supervision should be to leave the person supervised with the feelings of encouragement, stimulation, stronger commitment, resolve to do better, knowing how to do better. Supervision which leads either to demoralisation or to a perception that poor work passes unnoticed, is destructive. The balance, as all good supervisors know, lies between the 'professional fault finder' and the 'Father Christmas' who smiles on everything with never a hard word even for sloppiness and neglect.

These four measures are complementary. Pruning makes programming possible. Participation improves programming. And programming makes supervision more feasible. Work output, in theory at least, is improved through an achievable and inspectable work programme.

Other management procedures may be linked to particular purposes. One is the objective of involving in education-and-training programmes those rural people who are poorer, less-well-educated, less influential and of lower status. In the rhetoric of many national plans, of donor countries' and organisations' policy statements, and of the basic needs philosophy and orientation promoted by the ILO, the needs of the poorer people have priority. The question is to what extent education and training programmes, management procedures can contribute to the reorientation necessary; for as we have shown above, field staff tend to interact with local elites and ignore or be unaware of those who are poorer.

If a programme is oriented towards the poorer people, then management procedures may be used to improve the awareness of field staff and to strengthen the programme and keep it on target

surveys. Field staff can be brought into contact with some of the poorer people through the conduct of surveys. Taking a whole population as a universe, a truly random sample of adequate size should include a representative proportion of the poorer people if the universe is the whole population. Taking farmers only as a universe, then those who are landless will be left out. Alternatively, the universe may be specified in such a way (landless people, widows, harijas, those suffering from malnutrition) as to direct attention to those who are more deprived. If field staff are required to carry out such surveys systematically and to report their findings, they will be forced int contact with the poorer people and forced to find out about them.

poverty-oriented seminars. Surveys can be followed up by seminars at which results are reported by each staff member, and possible measures are discussed and worked out. The knowledge that survey results will have to be presented to peers and superiors should act asan incentive to carry out the survey properly.

selection criteria for participation. Programmes can be directed towards target groups through the operation of criteria for participation. As with other management procedures, there is much scope for distortion, and for benefits being captured by those who are already better off. In one case in Kenya an attempt was made to recruit to a training course only farmers who had not adopted certain innovations; but when the farmers arrived, a majority had already adopted one or the other. (Ascroft et al 197 The staff carrying out the selection were, it seems, unused to contact with and selection of such farmers.

Perhaps most important of all is what can be called the genetic code of the programme. A precondition for an education-and-trainir programme reaching the poorer rural people is that its design shall fit their needs, resources and abilities. A programme designed for literates, with printed material, tends to exclude illiterates. A programme concerned with a farm enterprise such as exotic cattle which only the better-off minority possess, will not directly touch the poorer people. Many programmes have built-in biases towards those who are better off. The lesson is to build into them opposite biases which benefit those who are less well off, for example by involving small-scale, cheap and simple equipment, and generating benefits to which the poorer people are likely to have access and which they will appreciate.

2. The Creation of a Unified Command

This option involves one department acting independently, unifying the chain of command, simplifying tasks, and working according to a clearly defined and closely supervised programme of work. This can be illustrated by examining the Training and Visit System (TVS) for agricultural extension, also known as the Benor system after its initiator Daniel Benor (Benor and Harrison 1977).

The TVS is an apparently highly successful approach to the reform of agricultural extension. It has been in operation in the Seyhan Project in Turkey for ten years, and has been adopted, in parts at least of Turkey, Burma, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and India.

The system is simple but not easy. An initial hard decision is to free extension staff of all responsibilities (such as reporting, data collection, and work for other departments) except those of the extension programme. A unified command structure is set up so that extension staff have only one master. Extension gaps are identified where farmers can benefit from improved practices largely or entirely through their own efforts and without reliance on purchased inputs (examples of such practices being improved seed selection, seedbed preparation, and weeding). Extension staff are then organised with "a systematic and quite rigid time-bound plan of their work" (Benor and Harrison 1977:11). This typically involves the first four days in a week on visits on a regular roster to contact farmers. Fridays are then spent in training sessions covering next advice to be given, and Saturdays on extra visits, office work, and make-up visits as necessary. Effort is concentrated on a narrow band of crops and practices at a time. Supervision is close, systematic and regular. Field level extension workers are backed up by subject matter specialists.

The learning process and the diffusion of the improved practices are sensitive to the sort of farmer who is selected for contact. Benor and Harrison recommend farmers who are "imitable", being neither the most progressive, who will tend to be regarded by others as exceptional and so less likely to be followed by their neighbours; nor very weak farmers who tend to be slow in adopting new methods. The contact farmers should be of good standing in

their community so that their views on new practices will be respected by other farmers. It is recommended that they should be selected in consultation with village leaders or elders.

The extension agents should recommend that farmers adopt the better practices at first on only a small part of their land. The contact farmers are asked to explain the recommendations they have received to several (up to 10) friends, relatives or neighbours and to help them adopt the recommendations.

According to the account given by Benor and Harrison, this system has worked wherever it has been tried. They do however caution that it is a recent development and has not yet run for more than a few years in most cases. They find that the status of field staff rises, their morale improves, their performance is better, and the impact on farming practices is considerable.

With any management innovation, cautious evaluation is prudent. Even so, this system does suggest something of a breakthrough on the management of field extension activities, with lessons which may well be applicable outside agriculture. But as so often with management innovation, a crucial question is replicability. The Benor system has already been replicated quite widely. But one may note that in this process morale and leadership are important ingredients. Benor and Harrison themselves issue a careful warning:

> "Before hastening to initiate something similar, perhaps a note of caution should be sounded so that the reader will pause to reflect on what has led to its success. The fundamental requirements are firm decisions to set priorities and concentrate efforts to ensure success right from the start. Such initial success generates growing enthusiasm for the system and the possibilities it offers of higher productivity in return for the hard work done both by the extension agents and by the farmers themselves. Without dedication, and particularly the enthusiasm which initially depends very much on the inspiration of the key personnel selected to put the system into operation, one might question whether it can be expected to succeed."(ibid.viii)

Conditions of TVS.

- a hierarchical arrangement of expertise and authority, by which those with least expertise and least authority are responsible for training the final learners - in this case, farmers.
- no expectation of initiative from those with least expertise; on the contrary, all new initiative flows from the superior echelons down to the subordinate.
- no expectation of full-participation from the final learners; on the contrary, total reliance is placed on persuaded-participation.
- no expectation of cooperation or coordination with other people-services and, at the same time, a refusal to offer cooperation; that is, autonomy and compartmentalisation are used as conditions of effectiveness.
- coordination is exercised solely within the boundaries of the extension system.
- the final learner is viewed only in the roles of agricultural producer and farm manager. There is no perspective on the 'whole person' nor is there any goal to do with social or political 'conscientization.'

Clearly, then, the Training and Visit System thus rejects the second mandate of the people-services and dedicates itself to the first. It focuses on initiatives to improve learning for production and management sacrifices co-ordination with other organisations, and does not seek full participation.

However, the TVS is not blindly authoritarian. Of acute interest is the way it organises its own personnel and new learners and maintains the morale and motivation of both. Its point of departure is the assumption that both have much to learn. The superior levels of the TVS learn through research, observation of current practices, experiment and controlled dialogue with subordinates. The lower levels learn through organised training, but apparently are given scope to offer their own experiences for joint evaluation with the superior levels. The learners themselves are not simply taught, but are visited on their

home ground for discussion and are encouraged to take part in experiments. In this way, constant interaction between research and dissemination is institutionalised, regularised and made obligato

Lessons of TVSs

As important as this continuous learning by all concerned are three points. One is the modest scope of the learning-goals set for the subordinate personnel. Second is the clear relevance to their jobs. Third is the immediacy of transmitting and applying what is learned. The same three points apply for the farmers, too, but are here reinforced by two further points. One is that what is to be larned, credibly promises a reward for learning - in terms of improved production, higher income or less labour. Second is that the reward is not reduced or made more remote by high costs in applying what is learned.

Small doses, immediate relevance, rapid application, clear reward and low costs to the learner appear to constitute a sound recipe for a programme of education-and-training.

For the personnel of the TVS, there are two further satisfactions, which promote good training. Their tasks are limited, not excessively general, nor excessively ambitious, relatively concrete, yielding relatively clear-cut results within a relatively short term. They can see something for what they have done. Second, the close supervision they receive increases the probability that their superiors will see what they have done: they have a greater chance of recognition and praise - which are important to the morale of most people.

The cost of so limiting the tasks of the field-workers is that the number of farmers with whom they regularly interact is small, in the region of 120 or so. A partial off-set is that the contact farmers themselves probably influence others. More deliberately, in order to counteract the bias for working only with the bigger, richer, more educated or more readily responsive farmers, the contact farmers are so selected as to represent a wide range within the farming community. Accordingly, it is hoped that a wide range of farmers will take note of and perhaps follow the contact farmers.

The discussion of TVS has so far dealt only with the end echelons of the education-and-training system: the farmers, the field-workers, their immediate supervisors and the subject matter specialists.

But decisions on the limitations of tasks, the priorities between tasks and on the degree of discretion to be granted to the middle levels have to be taken at a very high level indeed. The TVS has to be given room to work in and to be protected against attempts to dilute itself.

3. The One-Off National Campaign

In this option, all departments with rural field staff are involved simultaneously for a short period on a high priority national programme. This commonly occurs with national censuses and with elections. As the example which follows illustrates, it can also be used for learning campaigns.

The example is the radio learning group public consultation on the national policy on tribal grazing land in Botswana. In 1975 the Botswana Government published a White paper outlining a new national policy on tribal grazing land. This proposed new forms of land tenure and grazing organisation in order to deal with problems of overgrazing and of a scramble for the de facto appropriation of communal land by enterprising individuals. It proposed that some land should be made available on lease for commercial ranching; that other land would be for communal use by those with smaller herds; and that some other land would be held in reserve. Since this Tribal Grazing Land Policy (TGLP) would affect all rural dwellers, the Government wished both to explain the policy and to consult the people about it. As the population of Botswana is very widely scattered, and as radio learning groups (RLGs) had earlier been used successfully to explain and popularise the national plan, the Cabinet decided to mount a radio learning group public consultation on the new national land policy.

There already existed a Rural Extension Coordinating Committee on which all the ministries with rural field staff were represented. The Rural Extension Coordinating Committee set up a subcommittee - the Grazing Committee - to be responsible for the consultation. A full-time coordinator was appointed. The Grazing Committee organised working groups for (i) finance and administration, (ii) teaching materials, (iii) field worker training, (iv) feedback and evaluation, and (v) data interpretation and write up.

In each district the Grazing Committee liased with the district administration and local government staff to set up a new district team to be responsible for the consultation. District teams then formed village teams to run the consultation in the field. Membership of the village team, depending on the staff available in each area, was the head teacher of the primary school, the health educator (para-medical), the agricultural demonstrator, and the community development worker. Each member of the village team was to form learning groups and help the process of selection of learning group leaders. The head teachers were to recruit in the catchment areas of their schools, health educators at the clinic, community development workers in or close to the settlement, and agricultural demonstrators whose work took them further afield, in the more distant areas.

The consultation as a whole had four phases:

- the first phase was a national speaking tour by the President and the Ministers.
- the second phase consisted of briefings and seminars for government officers, local government staff, councillors, members of lan
- the third phase was the radio learning campaign, which included a pilot project; the preparation of materials; RLG RLG leader training courses; project information broadcasts; and broadcasts giving answers to questions sent in by groups.
- the fourth phase was the analysis of report forms sent in by RLGs

No attempt will be made here to describe at all fully the procedures and experience. These are well documented elsewhere (see references The scale of the operation can be gauged by the following figures:

Government field staff involved	over 800
RLG leaders trained	3,510
RLGs that sent in one or more report forms	3,173 (90%)
RLGs that sent in 9 or more forms (maximum 10)	1,737 (49%)
Average RLG size	17
Average attendance per member (approx.)	6.5 m
Questions answered over the radio by ministers	about 800

Approximately one adult in 6 was an RLG member. The campaign worked better in the rural areas than in the towns.

Evaluation is inherently difficult since there could be no effective control. On the one hand the mobilisation of government staff of different departments at the grassroots, the formation of listening groups, attendance at groups, and the submission of report forms from the groups appear to have been successful. The system of ministerial replies to questions was popular and one participant-observer recorded that when his RLG had its question answered "They went crazy, laughing, dancing and clapping each other on the back" (Republic of Botswana 1976:2) On the other hand, subsequent investigations showed considerable ignorance and uncertainty about some aspects of the proposed policy (Odell and Etherington 1977; Odell and Merafe 1977). The reader who wishes to pursue these issues is referred to the two main evaluation documents (Republic of Botswana 1976 and Crowley 1977).

Lessons of TGLP

In drawing lessons from this experience, one special characteristic of Botswana should be noted since it may affect replicability. The population - some 700,000 - is small. The organisational problems for a radio learning campaign were formidable, and aggravated by the wide geographical scatter of the population, but the total numbers of staff to train, of leaders to select, of forms to process, and so on were much more manageable than they would be in most countries.*

The main lessons which can be suggested from this experience are:

one-off national campaigns. A one-off campaign for non-formal education and involving the staff of different government departments can be carried off in favourable circumstances, which must include high political priority.

the use of departmental field staff. The TGLP campaign, which used departmental field staff, can be contrasted with the earlier radio learning campaign in which eight professional adult educators had been effectively in charge. In this earlier campaign much was achieved but in the long run an operational gap was demonstrated between the RLG leaders and the government. But, in the judgment of some who took part:

*However, the experiences in Tanzania with larger populations were successful also. Vide Hall 1974.

"In the TGLP Campaign (1976) the use of regular government staff made it possible to increase national coverage considerably. It also demonstrated that a great deal of (non-formal education) work can be carried out effectively by people with no particular expertise in non-formal education. Another benefit is that similar (non-formal education) work can now be carried out by these government workers. Continuity is possible."

(Crowley et al. 1977:91)

clear, simple tasks. In the words of one evaluation (Crowley et al 1977:63)

"In the .. Campaign .. the nation's field workers were engaged. They were expected to perform a relatively modest number of tasks which they in turn accomplished very well. It worked because the tasks were

a) clearly specified
b) realistic
c) relatively simple, and
d) kept few in number"

This stress on clarity and simplicity was also remarked on elsewhere:

"A major constraint on effective non-formal education work in the Third World is the co-ordination of the work at all levels of non-formal education agencies. The TGLP Campaign (1976) showed that for specific tasks where everyone involved is well briefed and knows precisely what he has to do, coordination and cooperation works" (ibid.77)

This of course echoes a lesson of the previous case study, Benor's TVS.

targetting - hunch, maths and commonsense

Field workers needed to know how many group leaders they should recruit. Districts were asked to plan on the basis of one RLG for every 100 citizens enumerated in the 1971 census. In practice this was complemented by and partly overridden by a system of top-down targetting in which each agricultural and community development worker was to recruit 10 RLGs, each primary school head teacher 4 RLGs and each Health Educator 2 RLGs.

The ratio of 1 group to 100 citizens would have produced 5,600 RLG leaders; the Village Teamworker quota system should have produced 4,300 RLG leaders. The actual figure for RLG leaders trained was 3,510.

The system as it emerged was known as HUM (hunch and maths). It was a loose form of indicative targetting to get the orders of magnitude right. It achieved substantial coverage but did leave gaps. As an evaluation put it:

"In the event, the District and Village Teams used these rough guides in ways that seemed sensible locally"

(Crowley 1977:157)

That is, there was sophistication in simplicity.

reaching the remote and the poor

Analysis of listenership showed a bias towards those who were more prosperous and better educated but this was less marked than might have been expected. It was the geographically remote poor people who were most left out.

"Coverage was widespread but even within the areas covered by the extension workers pockets of citizens were missed who might have been recruited if more attention had been paid to these areas. In areas not covered by extension workers citizens who were involved in the Campaign became involved on their own initiative entirely since no special arrangement was made for recruitment in those areas. The people missed were the remote rural poor who of all citizens should not have been missed. Mobile recruitment teams will deal with this problem in future..."

(Crowley et al 1977:79)

Large numbers of migrant labourers were also missed. As so often, special measures are needed for those most likely to be left out.

benefits to the learners.

- the content of the programme was of urgent interest to them,
- the interest was heightened by the participation of the President and Cabinet,
- the device of responding to queries from groups built up a sense of both importance and participation in the learners, as well as a trust in the sincerity of the government, and probably helped sustain motivation,
- the costs and inconveniences of participating were apparently not heavy, (even so the average attendance rate of 65 per cent is not conspicuously high.)

the potential of local leaders.

Relatively unschooled people were trained in a relatively short time to handle group responses and discussions sufficiently effectively for 90 per cent of them to have sent in questions. Leadership for a clear, if limited, purpose, was mobilised.

Comments.

The participation which was achieved in the radio groups was much more persuaded-participation than catalysed-participation, let alone full-participation. Nevertheless, in deciding to respond

in this fashion to what was evidently a matter of lively public conern, the government demonstrated its own concern that representative-participation should be shown to be effective. In sum, as with the Training and Visits System (pp. 83-87), the TGLP experience shows that satisfactory learning can be achieved in a relatively authoritarian training structure. It suggests also that, provided objectives, procedures and roles are all clear, independent departments can cooperate for a common, albeit directed, goal.

Two very similar cases which tend to confirm the lessons of TGLP in Botswana are the Tanzania radio campaigns, 'A Time for Rejoicing' and 'Man is Health'. Both have been fully described (Hall 1973, 1974).

One drawback of this approach is that it allows for very infrequent application. One such programme a year may be all a particular government machine can manage - given the difficulties over communication and joint planning - or all the various people -services can tolerate without resentment at the implicit downgrading of their own normal work.

A further potential drawback is lack of follow up and continuity. The learning may be important for the final learner, but it is difficult to build and develop it in a sustained way. It lacks the continuity of the school or even of the literacy classgroup. On the other hand, the leadership which is formed in the group discussion leaders can be capitalised on and developed through further use, as can participants' familiarity with the approach after the first time. The system set up for the TGLP consultation was later used again for consultation about District Development Plans in Botswana. The approach is one-off, but need not be once-for-all. It can be repeated, and should become easier to implement on subsequent rounds.

in this fashion to what was evidently a matter of liv
public conern, the government demonstrated its own co
representative-participation should be shown to be ef
In sum, as with the Training and Visits System (pp. 8
TGLP experience shows that satisfactory learning can
in a relatively authoritarian training structure. It
also that, provided objectives, procedures and roles
clear, independent departments can cooperate for a co
albeit directed, goal.

Two very similar cases which tend to confirm the less
TGLP in Botswana are the Tanzania radio campaigns, 'A
Rejoicing' and 'Man is Health'. Both have been fully
(Hall 1973, 1974).

One drawback of this approach is that it allows for
infrequent application. One such programme a year ma
particular government machine can manage - given the
over communication and joint planning - or all the va
people -services can tolerate without resentment at
implicit downgrading of their own normal work.

A further potential drawback is lack of follow up and
The learning may be important for the final learner,
is difficult to build and develop it in a sustained
lacks the continuity of the school or even of the li
classgroup. On the other hand, the leadership which
in the group discussion leaders can be capitalised o
developed through further use, as can participants'
with the approach after the first time. The system
the TGLP consultation was later used again for consu
about District Development Plans in Botswana. The a
is one-off, but need not be once-for-all. It can be
and should become easier to implement on subsequent

4. Learning from and with rural people

Our first case study, TVS, has demonstrated the possibility of organising continuous learning within a single government ministry, and appears to be an excellent response to the first mandate of the people-services - to initiate and spearhead development.

Our second case, TGLP, illustrates how the second mandate - coordination and cooperation between people-services - can be approached, even given the usual autonomous, pyramidal structures of authority.

For the third mandate - gaining sustained participation from the people in some form - we can offer no case which is both successful and without elements of coercion. The experiences of China, Tanzania, Algeria or Viet Nam all rely heavily upon a policy formulated by a single political party and executed both by the people-services and by the party itself. While policies and programmes have been modified and recast in response to suggestions, reactions and pressures from the people, and while there has certainly been decentralisation for implementation, the bounds for variation from central policy have been strictly marked. These experiences have been rather like the TVS case writ large across all aspects of learning for rural development. If political conditions favour such a system, its results have much to commend them.

In pluralist societies, where private inclination and interest are allowed wider latitude, participation has been more problematic. The literature of community development offers examples of projects, where learning for immediate purposes was achieved, but is less rich in models of learning which lead to self-propelled and accelerating development on the part of rural communities. One important factor in this disappointment has been the structure of expertise, which reinforces the structure of authority and produces an inability to learn from people whose expertise is not vouched for by at least one certificate. If the experts were helped and encouraged to learn from uncertified practitioners, then disappointments might be reduced and participation increased - even within existing structures.

The proposal would demand a reversal of roles. There are four reasons why such a reversal would be beneficial.

First, unless extension agent or teacher understands the way his clients think and the way they perceive their environment, communication will be impeded and may be misleading.

Second, local technical knowledge is likely in some respects to be superior to and more useful than scientific knowledge. Evidence has been accumulated (Belshaw 1978, Howes 1978, Howes and O'Keefe 1978, Richards 1978, Swift 1978)

to show that indigenous rural technical knowledge, notably concerning what can be directly observed, is quite often more detailed and more useful than imported scientific knowledge; but that the two are best seen as complementary, not antagonistic. For example, the Hanunoo of the Philippines have been found able, on average, to be able to name 1600 plants, which compares with a mere 1200 identified in a botanical survey of the same area. Elsewhere, much of value has been found in local systems of counting and quantification, in divisions of the calendar, in environmental knowledge, in medicine, colour discriminations, in use of plant indicators for fertility, and so on.

Third, ignoring local knowledge and systems of thought militates against full participation by rural people in the development process, inducing attitudes of dependence, a loss of local knowledge and lore which is then not passed on to the next generation, and a sort of cultural emasculation.

Fourth, with most if not all innovations, it is only through partnership in learning, with the extension agent or teacher and the client or learner taking part jointly, that the innovation can be developed and adapted for local needs and conditions and, as it were, possessed by the adopter or learner.

The reversals implied in learning from and with rural people are difficult to achieve. They require major

switches of attitudes and changes of behaviour on the part of extension agents and teachers. They require listening instead of speaking; learning instead of teaching; accepting the role, even is only temporarily, of pupil instead of that of instructor.

In suggesting ways in which those reversals may be achieved, we do not cite systems of organisation or management which have been tested to the same extent as with, for example, the TVS or the One-off National Campaign. We do, however, suggest three approaches which look promising:

(i) research as part of training

Educators of all sorts acquire their approaches to education and learning not only from their childhood and school experiences,but also from the ways in which they are formed for their jobs. If their trainers value learning from the people, practise it themselves and show the trainees how to do it, the reversal we suggest is much more likely to occur. As part of their training, then, educators, be they extension agents or school-teachers, should be required to carry out research with rural people on their systems of knowledge. How do illiterate farmers categorise soils, for example, or herbs or crops? On what principles do they manage their farms? How do un-schooled mothers learn to count and manage money, when they have it? What sorts of history do the community elders - men and women - hold, which might be of far more

vital interest to schoolchildren than the ordinary textbooks? Topics could be chosen in which local knowledge might either have some comparative advantage or offer a different way of viewing things.

In this way, educators could be educated to organise their learning programmes on the basis of understanding and respect for the learners.

(ii) playing games

Experience in West Africa (Richards 1978) suggests that there may be considerable potential in learning from rural people through the use of games. One approach is to seat knowledgeable people back-to-back, and give them varieties of, say, rice, and ask them to describe those varieties without naming them, the back-to-back partner having to guess it. This reveals the characteristics of the item which are considered significant. Perhaps the most promising game is based on Kelly's 'personal construct' theory ( ). According to Kelly, all people are hypothesis-formulators and testers; we are all scientists, and we all have constructs which we use to categorise experience and objects. These constructs can be elicited in various ways. For our purposes, the triad test (as used by Richards in Sierra Leone) appears to have exciting potential.

Richards asked farmers to select four weeds which were locally important. These were then presented, in com-

binations of threes, (the triads), to respondents who were asked to discriminate by pairing two as similar and to isolate the third as different. They were then asked to explain the 'construct' underlying the discrimination, and where appropriate to scale other weeds according to the same construct. The game was played with three groups of people: Sierra Leonian University botany and biogeography students; farmers; and extension staff. There was no overlap between the constructs of the students and those of the farmers. The students' constructs showed a preoccupation with morphology and Linnean taxonomy. The farmers' constructs included difficulty of clearing the weeds and secondary medicinal uses. But the surprise was that the extension trainees had almost identical constructs to the university students. Richards records:

> "This proved to be of great 'diagnostic' value, leading to a spontaneous hour-long seminar discussion by the trainees on how they would communicate with farmers if the 'scientific' approach to farming made them think in text-book botanical terms rather than in terms of farming utilities. Tentative action proposals for syllabus reform and for studying alongside the farmers were beginning to emerge at the end of the period." (1978:9)

In considering replication of this approach, in training courses, it may be noted the game can so be organised that it places the farmers and the trainees on an equal footing, and even has a self-effacing effect for the trainees; and that this may be acceptable because the game is enjoyed by both farmers and trainees.

(iii) encouraging 'learners' to work out the implications of a change for themselves

This seems a most elementary suggestion, yet it is all too rarely followed. It can take the form of inviting participants say in a farmer training course to work out the profitability, or otherwise, of a recommended practice; of issuing small amounts of seed of a number of varieties of a crop together with fertiliser, in mini-kits, to farmers, allowing them to conduct their own experiments on their farms. The change in the routine or the organisation may be slight; but the learning and adopting process may be great. Moreover the 'teacher' will then be enabled through this process to learn from the clients, with feed-back to further advice.

We do not underestimate the difficulties in implementing these three ideas. Reversals of role are not easy. However, the first two proposals - research during training, and playing games - can both be part of training which is not explicitly a teaching or extension experience, and so be more acceptable. The third proposal can be introduced as a required and standardised routine. No doubt many other suggestions can be put forward. A prime criterion in assessing them should always be implementability. While there is room for much to go wrong in implementing these three proposals, our best judgement is that they are promising and well worth trying. They should at least prepare the way for equal interchange between educators and learners as a step towards full participation.

5. The School and other education

Our cases for options so far have involved only adults and only learning programmes outside the school. The sole involvement of schools or teachers was in TGLP, where headmasters were called on to help organise radio learning groups. Yet it may be recalled that in terms of resources consumed, the schools and universities of a country represent the largest and best endowed education and training programme. Two examples will substantiate the point. In 1971, Tanzania had 20,672 primary school teachers but only 1,129 agricultural personnel actually teaching adults, a ratio of 18:1, (Kassam, 1975). In 1975, Ghana devoted to the total operations of the General Agricultural Department, the Institute of Adult Education and the Department of Community Development four per cent of total government expenditure, while the schools and universities received just over 24 per cent, (Ghana Government, 1975). It is legitimate then to ask whether there are cases where the school has successfully been brought to share or stretch its resources by undertaking more than its first mandate. Can it be articulated with other programmes of education-and-training for rural populations? More important, can it be so articulated on a long term, permanent basis?

In posing these questions, we cannot but be aware of the long history of attempts to broaden the functions of the school. On the one hand, there have been the reforms to

make the content and activities of the school more helpful and relevant to those pupils - the majority in most countries - who will have to take up rural occupations. On the other hand has been the idea that the school should so interact with the community of its students that it both becomes a local engine of development and is itself enriched by the resources of the community. Batten in 1959, Griffiths in 1968 and Sinclair in 1977 have in turn reviewed the generally melancholy histories of such efforts. The causes of disappointment have been manifold and not easy to weigh against each other.

Even so, it seems clear that there are two general factors which are crucial. One is the bias of incentive and reward within a society. If urban occupations are blatantly better rewarded than rural, if urban life is blatantly better serviced than rural and if the only way into urban occupations and life is success in the school and university, then it becomes almost impossible to orient the school to rural development. The attention of parents, pupils and teachers is inevitably riveted on the road to the city. Distractions are in general resented, brushed aside, ignored.

However, the phrase 'in general' is to be noted. No matter how unsuccessful a reform has been in overall terms, there seem always to have been individual cases, sometimes in substantial proportions, of local success. This brings us to the second general factor, the teachers. Where a

teacher has been personally enthused by the reforms, s/he has treated the difficulties in implementing them as challenges to ingenuity and has pressed ahead. Where personal enthusiasm has been less strong among the teachers but has been supplemented by proper supports of clear goals, guidance and training, workable methods, sympathetic supervision, material and equipment and professional recognition, there has again been some success.

What this implies is that the biases in the school against involving itself with education for rural development can be at least partially counteracted, if the school-teachers are wisely mobilised and supported. This is very much a matter of organisation and management. The effort which goes into it must be powerful, simply because the urban bias, against which it is pitted, is itself so notoriously strong.

Such an observation is true, if the school is making only internal reforms, affecting only the teachers and the students. It gains even more force, if the intent is to get the school to go beyond its own bounds and cooperate with other people services in a mutual improvement of programmes. If the ambition is to go further and organise some form of sustained cross-fertilisation between school and community, the quality of thought, planning, organisation and implementation will need to be very high indeed.

As far as we know, there is no well established case of sustained cross-support and cross-fertilisation between the school and other forms of education-and-training. However, we by no means argue that efforts towards such interaction should cease. Quite the contrary. Indeed, they continue, as is evidenced by Tanzania's shortening the school-day in order to allow schoolteachers working time for adult and community education; by Ghana's Continuation Schools, where extension workers and local craftsmen are called in to teach classes; by Sri Lanka's programme of Pre-Vocational Studies, in which teachers collaborating with local people and with the national Curriculum Development Centre developed some 80 examinable syllabuses in local occupations and livelihoods.* What we do urge is that the fresh efforts be based on the lessons of previous experiments, so that old mistakes are not built into new programmes. In this regard, the pilot work of UNESCO and some half dozen governments is relevant.

Their objective is gradually to develop "integrated approaches to education for rural development". Perhaps the best way to explain the strategy is through a case study: the project just beginning in Iraq will serve. In the light of our earlier remarks, the relationship of the project to the biases and incentives of the larger society needs explanation.

---

* It is reported that the new Government of Sri Lanka, elected in August 1977, is drastically reviewing the Prevocational Studies Programme.

Urban bias does exist in Iraq and is powerful: almost two-thirds of the population already live in towns, even though some 30 per cent of the arable land is not used. Incomes from city and government jobs do tend to be rather higher than incomes from farms and, what is more, the towns tend to be short of manpower, so that jobs are not difficult to find. On the other hand, the government is vigorously pushing piped water, electricity, health services, better schools and better roads into the rural communities. With these come numerous rural projects offering wage employment in home areas. Alongside these are expanding extension services, cooperatives and other facilities to promote agricultural productivity. Also, the government takes measures to prevent the larger towns from 'underdeveloping' the smaller, by ensuring that goods of every sort are evenly distributed among the population. In this way, the disincentives to rural life are being perceptibly reduced. The implication is that the project for 'integrated education' is not isolated in a lone struggle: a supporting environment is being created gradually.

As far as the school is concerned, it is just as important in Iraq as elsewhere to get a school certificate, if one wants a 'decent' secure job. It is also as true in Iraq as elsewhere that mere primary schooling, or even intermediate schooling, (9 years), will no longer guarantee a 'decent' job. The anxiety about qualifications is therefore just as likely to run counter to 'relevant' or 'work-oriented'

or rural education. However, the problem has been mitigated by three actions. First, the numbers of intermediate and secondary schools have been sufficiently increased to allay worry about selection: there are almost enough places for everybody who reaches the required standard. Second, the primary schools have been given the authority to graduate their own students: there are no longer standard centralised examinations at the end of six years of school. How the goals of primary schooling will be attained is therefore much more in the hands of the class-room teacher than it used to be. S/he can now interact creatively with syllabuses and school-inspectors, rather than submissively follow the requirements of an exam crucial to his/her students' futures. Third, technical and vocational schools are to be increased ten-fold over the coming years - from their present bare five per cent of secondary enrolments to nearly fifty. Not only are the primary teachers freer to experiment with education, the technical schools will provide some justification for introducing studies and activities more relevant to environments and livelihoods.

In short, both the social and the educational systems are being made much more hospitable to education for rural development. How does the project for 'integrated education' propose to capitalise on this situation?

In the first place, the project's leadership has selected an area where the improvement of rural conditions is very

obvious. Not only are almost all households already equipped with piped water and electricity, the majority even enjoy refrigerators and televisions. Preventable diseases appear to be well under control, so that local medical personnel belive that both morbidity and mortality rates have declined substantially. A Development Corporation has a team of agricultural advisors on a ratio of two for each cooperative of 200 farmers, as well as a network of women's and youth centres. And there are sufficient primary and intermediate schools to permit all the children of the area a minimum of nine years of school. If 'integrated approaches' in rural education are at all feasible, they should be feasible in this project area.

Second, the project's leadership recognises that the critical points lie in the classrooms of the schools and in the interactions between the adult community and extension workers of various kinds. At the same time, the usual patterns of people-services with separate and pyramidal structures of authority and expertise prevail and cannot be altered to suit the project. The mechanisms to handle this situation are two. One is a team of 11 specialists in various fields of education in and out of school, entirely under the authority of the Ministry of Education. These personnel are stationed in the project area, are provided with transport and are within very easy reach of the communities and schools concerned. They are not simply occasional visitors. The second mechanism

is a Local Planning Committee, comprising representatives of all the agencies with development and educational concerns in the area. Besides the people-services themselves, the Ba'ath Socialist Party, the National Union of Women, the National Union of Students, the local Cooperatives Union and similar organisations participate in the committee. They are in turn divided into seven task-forces, invited to initiate and plan activities which the specialist team, jointly with extension educators or schoolteachers, will implement. The heavy commitment of personnel is intended to ensure both the sparking of new ideas through dialogue and experiment and close support to prevent feelings of isolation, either in the specialists or in the local creative educators.

Third, there is little in the way of detailed preconceived activities. The project is to proceed from a study of the locality and from a collaborative identification of possiblities for improvements in learning for improvements in local life.

Fourth, it is accepted that overnight miracles are not possible. The Specialist team and Local Planning Committee have been asked to work initially with only two communities. After 18 months of study and preparation, they have been given a further year to find ways of working with the community, school and educators, both to help improve the

execution of their first mandates and to bring them together to promote the second and third mandates. Thereafter, they will be expected to move out to more communities and schools in the area. Only much later will there follow expansion to other areas with other teams.

Finally, it is accepted that a reform articulating all the institutions of rural education cannot be done on the cheap. The project has been funded generously.

It goes without saying that even the neatest scheme will develop its own problems, so that the project in Iraq will not progress with unalloyed smoothness. Nevertheless, the point worth making is that the 'integrated approach' does constitute an attempt to take advantage of the lessons of earlier experiences. It does try to construct a strategy which will use the advantages of Iraq's situation and consciously identify and dismantle the obstacles. Given such care and commitment, the project should be able to help articulate the school's learning with learning in the larger community, to the benefit of both.

6. Generals to the Front!

None of our cases has involved alternation to the usual pyramidal structures of authority and expertise. However, the project in Iraq does put specialists right out in the field, in positions where normally less qualified and experienced personnel might be expected. The majority of the specialists are not only well experienced but are university trained as well. They are of a calibre which can be expected to conceive and execute well informed and well judged initiatives. They represent the beginnings of a reversal of style. The generals - at any rate, potential generals - are beginning to move to the front line.

What this means is that the tendency to reserve all initiative for the central authorities can begin to be reversed also. If one of the factors which reinforces centralism is doubt about the competence of the personnel in the outposts, then raising the level of the latter should permit a similar rise in confidence at the centre. An equilisation of professional expertise between centre and outpost should at least pave the way for an equalisation of authority, control of resources and career incentives. The supreme and intermediate centres should increasingly be able to function mainly as a general guiding mechanism, while - subject to political considerations - the outposts should be increasingly able to create learning programmes tailored to local circumstances. In this connection, it is relevant to remark that, among the centrally planned economies, those which appear to be having encouraging results are those which have arranged to delegate much discretion to the outposts, whether they be factories, as in Yugoslavia, or village production teams, as in China.

Equalising expertise across the country raises several practical questions. The most obvious concerns the supply of expertise. On the one hand, we have mentioned the scarcity of educators, especially in the rural areas; and we have emphasised the even greater scarcity of well qualified educators. On the other, we talk about pushing or attracting the well qualified to the outposts. Are the well qualified actually available?

Three considerations arise in answering this question. The first is the supply and calibre of people who could be educators. In many countries, the schools and universities have not yet produced enough people of a level to be trained as high quality educators. Fifteen years ago, such a statement would have been true of most developing countries. In the late seventies it is much less true, simply because school and university enrolments have been increasing at such very fast rates. Indeed, where once India or Sri Lanka, for example, were unusual in having large numbers of 'educated unemployed', they are now merely early cases of a widespread phenomenon. The Employment Missions of the I.L.O. to Colombia, Sri Lanka, Kenya, the Philippines, Iran and the Sudan provide some evidence of this. Indeed, so great is the supply of educated people, that the educational qualifications demanded for entry to whole ranges of jobs have been rising. In many countries, then, the critical factor is not the supply of the educated, but the uses to which they are put.

Here we touch the matter of policy. On the one hand, the numbers of posts created for various types of rural educators are insufficient to meet the needs. This is an issue of priorities and the allocation of resources. On the other hand, rural educators have not in the past been drawn from the highly

highly educated where the less educated used to be. Alongside this, the highly educated do not expect to do work once done by the less educated. Further, the highly educated are by and large more expensive than the less educated, and expect to remain more expensive. Consequently, if a government did decide to increase the numbers of rural educators, but wanted to put better educated and trained people in the outposts, it would probably have to pay a considerably higher bill. This consideration may well be a constraint to using the supply of the educated. Given the rigidities of a civil service, the tendency may be to regard this as a binding constraint. Yet, as will be suggested a little further on, there may be ways of relaxing it.

Third, it can be argued that even the educators who are available are notoptimally distributed. An analysis of many a people-service would find a large proportion of its better educators confined, possibly willingly, to offices and to towns. It may be contered that soundly manned administrative centres are vital to effective outposts. On the other hand, well manned outposts could conceivably dispense with intermediary ties of administration and flatter patterns of organisation may yield both better administration and greater effectiveness.=

Since we know of no cases - even incipient ones - which can illustrate what we have in mind, we resort to a hypothetical scenario. Obviously, the sketch cannot be too detailed; we hope it is enough to provide a credible stimulus.

A government accepts that rural development requires programmes of education-and-training, in addition to other factors like capital, water supplies, wages and price structures and so on. It believes that such programmes would best be created through close interaction with the people who need to learn and that

the best educators available should be at the centre of such interaction. It appreciates that current career patterns do not encourage the best educators to stay with the learners and that urban bias draws the educators away from rural learners. It perceives that the rural schools can be oriented to rural development and education, only if parents, pupils and teachers are freed from anxieties about selection either for higher education or for 'modern' wage and salary employment.

The government divides the country into a large number of very small development areas (DAs), each comprising around 5,000 people. Each DA is graded on a 'hardship' scale from which a scale of inducement allowances, benefits and privileges is calculated: the greater the hardship the more generous the privileges for those who work under it. Each DA can recruit a team of trained educators comprising an appropriate number and range of school teache s and extension educators. The educators are inducted as a team and given the mandate to work with the population for all forms of social and economic development.

The educators are independent of any particular people-service, except in regard to the evaluation of performance within the area of competence of a particular people-service. Even there, the criteria of performance are agreed between the DAs and the people-service. The people-services act chiefly as standard-setters, trainers and consultants but can also offer incentives for cooperation on particular projects. They arrange frequent study visits and conferences for the educators, in order to maintain stimulation, creativity and a flow of new knowledge and ideas. Their promotion for the team of educators consists primarily in salary bonuses awarded on the basis of the performance of the DA as a whole on the agreed criteria.

since dissatisfaction can arise between a DA and particular educators, transfers between DAs can be arranged by the DAs themselves, but not by any other authority.

The recruitment of the educators is as follows:

- the job is defined as membership of a particular team of educators for a particular DA in a particular field of expertise;
- the basic salaries are uniform across the country, but are modified by the 'hardship' allowances;
- no general educational qualification is stipulated; for people without particular expertise, training is offered in the form of alternating periods of work and study;
- selection is mainly through carefully devised aptitude tests, derived from the actual functions of an educator and from the kinds of relationship s/he is expected to form with colleagues and learners.

Within this framework, the DA and its educator team work out their priorities for development and, from there, their needs for learning. In the case of the rural primary schools, the Ministry of Education sets standards only for basic literacy, numeracy and civics. Each school graduates its own pupils, but is subject to moderation by the ministry, which reports to the DA and its team on its findings. In this way, the DA can watch both the curriculum and the quality of instruction, while the teachers are answerable to the community of their pupils.

Selection for secondary and higher education is by combination of quotas from each DA and of performance. In this way, parents and teachers are enabled to attend to the broader purposes of education and to encourage cross-fertilisation between school and other forms of learning.

A scenario of this nature could not of course be realised overnight. Nor is it without many dangers. For instance, it offers no guarantee that the educators and the more powerful citizens of a DA will not collaborate to use the development resources for their own benefit. Yet, in perceiving its flaws, readers may see other and better means by which the institutional impediments to the three mandates and to good education-and-training may be avoided.

THE MAIN THRUST

We have argued that organising education and training for rural development faces many problems which stem from bureaucratic organisation and staff behaviour. Bureaucratic organisation entails hierarchy, standardisation, and outward flows of information upwards and inwards to the centre. Staff behaviour is influenced by urban aspirations, is based towards the local rural elite, and is related to status flowing from modern knowledge. In consequence, full participation in learning by rural people, especially the poorer rural people, is difficult. It involves kicking against the pricks, against the nature of bureaucracy, against social forces, and against personal aspirations among many of those in the trainer or teacher role.

There is no one panancea. Tasks and situations differ, and offer different problems and opportunities, requiring solutions. The danger, as so often when difficult problems are analysed, is that the obstacles are dissected in great detail, that solutions are briefly suggested, and then a problem is found for every solution. We have tried to show a range of possible positive approaches, throwing down challenges to innovate. These approaches or options are very different from one another. These approaches or options are very different from one another. Management procedures, it is true, are a common element to all of them. But there is a sharp contrast in style and organisation between, say, the isolation from other organisations of the Training Benor System and the coordination of several departments in the One-off National Campaign; or between the imparting of a standardised

message in the Benor System and the openness to learning from rural people in learning by games. Nevertheless, running through all these approaches there are three principles which together constitute the main thrust of this paper.

The first principle is that simple is optimal. Pruning workloads is recommended as a management procedure. The Benor System has as a sine qua non the elimination of all demands from other organisations upon the time of contact staff and the simplification and routinisation of advice and activities. Clear simple tasks were an essential element in the success of the national ratio learning campaign. Where procedures are simple and tasks clear, and manageable, staff morale is likely to be higher, and their contact is likely to be with a wider group of clients.

The second principle is the reverse flow of mutual learning. Those who are teachers or trainers, extension staff or educators, cannot teach unless they can learn. This applies least in the Benor System although even there identifying and dealing with the problems encountered by farmers, and reporting these back, is important. More clearly, this applies with radio learning groups to the centre. It is with learning by games that this principle of mutual learning is most clearly seen. Education and training will often be most effective if the educators and trainers begin by learning from those they are to educate or train.

The third principle is pluralism. Many initiatives are needed. There is no standard model. There is much to be said for a

sequence of innovations and for plurality of organisations. The value of integration and coordination are easily exaggerated. There can be too many organisations, but there can also be too few. What seems vital is that inventiveness should be brought to bear, and new approaches continue to be devised and tried out. It should be possible, then, to add many more to the suggestions to the challenges to innovate; and the outcome should be more sensitive and effective education and training for rural development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

We are grateful to Raymond Lyons for constructive comments on an earlier version. We also wish to express our special appreciation to Maureen Dickson for her patience and good humour in dealing with difficult and often absent authors and manuscripts, and for her stamina in ensuring that the outcome was a clean typescript. Without her this monograph would not have been produced.

REFERENCES

Argenti, John, 1976, "Whatever Happened to Management Techniques?", Management Today, April.

Ascroft, Joseph, Niels Röling, Joseph Kariuki and Fred Chege, 1973, Extension and the Forgotten Farmer: First Report of a Field Experiment, Bulletin Nr. 37, Afdelingen voor Sociale Wetenschappen aan de Landbouwhogeschool, Wageningen.

Barker, David, Julius Oguntoyinbo and Paul Richards 1977, The Utility of the Nigerian Peasant Farmer's Knowledge in the Monitoring of Agricultural Resources, General Report 4, MARC (Monitoring and Assessment Research Centre of the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment, International Council of Scientific Unions), Chelsea College, University of London.

Bataille, L., (ed), 1976, A Turning Point for Literacy: Adult Education for Development: The Spirit and Declaration of Persepolis, Pergamon Press, London.

Batten, T.R., 1959, School and Community in the Tropics, Oxford University Press, London.

Baviskar, B., 1978, The Politics of Development: Sugar Cooperatives in Rural Maharashtra, Oxford University Press, Delhi (forthcoming).

Beeby, C., 1966, The Quality of Education in Developing Countries, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. USA.

Belshaw, Deryke and Robert Chambers, 1973, "Managing Rural Development: Lessons and Methods from Eastern Africa", Discussion Paper No. 15, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Belshaw, D.G.R., 1978, "Taking Indigenous Technology Seriously: the Case of Inter-cropping Systems in East Africa", paper for the Workshop on the Uses of Indigenous Technical Knowledge, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Benor, Daniel and James Q. Harrison, 1977, Agricultural Extension: the Training and Visit System, World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20433, USA.

Bhasin, K., 1977, Participatory Training for Development, FAO, Rome.

Brooke, N., 1978, Aspirations and Quality in Education in Rural Mexico, IDS, Sussex (forthcoming).

Chambers, Robert, 1974, Managing Rural Development: Ideas and Experience from East Africa, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala.

Chambers, Robert, and B.W.E. Wickremanayake, 1977, "Agricultural Extension: Myth, Reality and Challenge", in B.H. Farmer, (ed.), pp.155-167.

Chinnappa, B. Nanjamma, 1977, "The Adoption of the New Technology in North Arcot District", in B.H. Farmer (ed.), pp.92-123.

Cliffe, Lionel, et al, 1968, "An Interim Report on the Evaluation of Agricultural Extension", Rural Development Research Committee, Rural Development Paper No. 5, University College, Dar es Salaam, September.

Conklin, H.C., 1957, Hamumoo Agriculture. A Report on an Integral System of Shifting Cultivation in the Philippines, FAO Forestry Development Paper No. 12.

Crone, C., 1976, Research On Innovative Nonformal Education for Rural Women. Phase 1, World Education, New York.

Crowley, David, Alan Etherington and Ross Kidd, 1977, Radio Learning Group Manual, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1, Kolner Strasse 149, West Germany.

Dubey, D.C., Willis A. Sutton and Gladys Gallup, 1962, Village Level Workers: Their Work and Result Demonstrations, National Institute of Community Development, Government of India, published by Manager of Publications, Delhi.

Dumont, R., 1966, False Start in Africa, Andre Deutsch, London.

Farmer, B.H. (ed.), 1977, Green Revolution? Technology and Change in Rice-Growing Areas of Tamil Nadu and Sri Lanka, Macmillan, London and Basingstoke.

Ghana Government, 1975, Annual Estimates of Expenditure, Accra.

Griffiths, V.L., 1968, The Problems of Rural Education, International Institute of Educational Planning, Paris.

Hall, B., 1973, Wakati WaFuraha: An Evaluation of a Radio Study Group Campaign, Research Report No. 13, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Hall, B., A. Dodds, 1974, Voices for Development: The Tanzanian National Radio Study Campaigns, International Extension College, Cambridge.

Halse, Michael (ed), 1967, Studies in Block Development and Cooperative Organisation, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.

Harrison, R.K., 1969, "Work and Motivation: A Study of Village Level Agricultural Extension Workers in the Western State of Nigeria", mimeo, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, Ibadan.

Hatch, John K., 1976, The Corn Farmers of Motupe; a Study of Traditional Farming Practices in Northern Coastal Peru, Land Tenure Center Monographs No. 1, Land Tenure Center, 1525 Observatory Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, (246p.)

Heginbotham, Stanley J., 1975, Cultures in Conflict: The Four Faces of Indian Bureaucracy, Columbia University Press, New York and London.

Holtham, Gerald and Arthur Hazlewood, 1976, Aid and Inequality in Kenya: British Development Assistance to Kenya, Croom Helm, London.

Howes, Michael, 1978, "The Uses of Indigenous Technical Knowledge in Development", paper for the Workshop on the Uses of Indigenous Technical Knowledge, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Hunter, Guy, 1970, The Administration of Agricultural Development: Lessons from India, Oxford University Press,

Hursch, Gerald D., Niels R. Röling and Graham B. Kerr, 1968, "Innovation in Eastern Nigeria: Success and Failure of Agricultural Programs in 71 Villages of Eastern Nigeria", Diffusion of Innovations Research Report 8, Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Kassam, Y.O., 1975, The Relationship between Formal and Non-Formal Education: A Tanzanian Case Study, African Adult Education Association (mimeo).

Kelly, G.A., 1955, The Psychology of Personal Constructs, 2 Vols., Norton, New York.

Kulp, Earl M., 1970, Rural Development Planning: Systems Analysis and Working Method, Praeger, New York.

Kulp, Earl M., 1977, Designing and Managing Basic Agricultural Programs, PASITAM (Program of Advanced Studies in Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodology), International Development Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Laframboise, H.L., 1971, "Administrative Reform in the Federal Public Service: Signs of a Saturation Psychosis", Canadian Public Administration, Vol. 14, No. 3.

Leonard, David (ed.), 1973, Rural Administration in Kenya, East African Literature Bureau, Nairobi.

Leonard, David K., 1977, Reaching the Peasant Farmer: Organizational Theory and Practice in Kenya, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Mathur, Kuldeep, 1972, Bureaucratic Response to Development: A Study of Block Development Officers in Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, National Press, Delhi.

Mbithi, Philip M., 1973, "Agricultural Extension as an Intervention Strategy: an Analysis of Extension Approaches in Kenya", in Leonard, D. (ed.).

Mook, Byron, 1974, "Value and Action in Indian Bureaucracy", Discussion Paper No. 65, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Moris, Jon R., 1977, "The Transferability of Western Management Concepts and Programs, an East African Perspective", in Stifel et al, eds., pp.73-83.

Nair, Kusum, 1961, Blossoms in the Dust: The Human Element in Indian Development, Duckworth, London.

Odell, Malcolm J., and Alan Etherington, 1977, "Tribal Grazing Land Policy Consultation Campaign: the Results of the Baseline Survey of May/June 1976", Joint Monograph Ministry of Agriculture Rural Sociology Report Series, No. 4, and Botswana Extension College Technical Note, No. 5, on the Tribal Grazing Land Policy Radio Learning Group Consultation Campaign, Gaborone.

Odell, Malcolm J. Jr. and Yvonne B.B. Merafe, 1977, "Seminar Report on Socio-economic Monitoring of the Tribal Grazing Land Policy", Rural Sociology Report Series, No. 10, Ministry of Agriculture, Gaborone.

Olatunbosun, Dupe, 1968, "Nigerian Farm Settlements and School Leavers' Farms - Profitability, Resource Use and Social Psychological Considerations", Consortium for the Study of Nigerian Rural Development Report No. 9, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

P.R.A.I. (1958), The Gram Sevak in Uttar Pradesh: a study of his role, workload and relationships, - Planning, Research and Action Institute, Uttar Pradesh, Kalankar House, Lucknow.

Republic of Botswana, 1975, National Policy on Tribal Grazing Land, Government Paper No. 2 of 1975, Government Printer, Gaborone.

Republic of Botswana, 1976, "Preliminary Report on the Public Consultation on the National Policy on Tribal Grazing Land", Ministry of Local Government and Lands, Gaborone, November.

Republic of Botswana, 1977, Lefatshe La Rona - Our Land: The report on the Botswana Government's Public Consultation on its policy proposals on Tribal Grazing Land, Ministry of Local Government and Lands, (printed by the Government Printer), Gaborone.

Richards, Paul, 1978, "Community Environmental Knowledge in Rural Development", paper for the Workshop on the Uses of Indigenous Technical Knowledge, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Rogers, E. and R. Shoemaker, 1971, Communication of Innovations: a Cross Cultural Approach, Free Press, New York.

Sapolsky, Harvey M., 1972, The Polaris System Development: Bureaucratic and Programmatic Success in Government, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.

Sinclair, M., 1977, School and Community in the Third World, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex (mimeo pending publication).

Srinivasan, L., 1977, Perspectives on Non formal Adult Learning, World Education, New York.

Ssennyonga, Joseph, 1976, "The Cultural Dimensions of Demographic Trends", Populi, Vol. 3, No. 2.

Stifel, Laurence D., James S. Coleman and Joseph E. Balck, 1977, Education and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries, a special report from the Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation.

Swift, Jeremy, 1978, "Notes on Traditional Knowledge, Modern Knowledge and Rural Development", paper for the Workshop on the Uses of Indigenous Technical Knowledge, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.

UNESCO, 1976, The Experimental World Literacy Programme: A Critical Assessment, Paris.

Unger, J., 1978, Qualifications and Schools in China, IDS, (forthcoming).

in this fashion to what was evidently a matter of lively public conern, the government demonstrated its own concern that representative-participation should be shown to be effective. In sum, as with the Training and Visits System (pp. 83-87), the TGLP experience shows that satisfactory learning can be achieved in a relatively authoritarian training structure. It suggests also that, provided objectives, procedures and roles are all clear, independent departments can cooperate for a common, albeit directed, goal.

Two very similar cases which tend to confirm the lessons of TGLP in Botswana are the Tanzania radio campaigns, 'A Time for Rejoicing' and 'Man is Health'. Both have been fully described (Hall 1973, 1974).

One drawback of this approach is that it allows for very infrequent application. One such programme a year may be all a particular government machine can manage - given the difficulties over communication and joint planning - or all the various people -services can tolerate without resentment at the implicit downgrading of their own normal work.

A further potential drawback is lack of follow up and continuity. The learning may be important for the final learner, but it is difficult to build and develop it in a sustained way. It lacks the continuity of the school or even of the literacy classgroup. On the other hand, the leadership which is formed in the group discussion leaders can be capitalised on and developed through further use, as can participants' familiarity with the approach after the first time. The system set up for the TGLP consultation was later used again for consultation about District Development Plans in Botswana. The approach is one-off, but need not be once-for-all. It can be repeated, and should become easier to implement on subsequent rounds.